

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

it possible to be at once a religious man and a rationalist? Mr. David GRAHAM says it is quite possible. More than that, he holds that the only truly religious man is the rationalist.

Mr. GRAHAM is the author of *The Grammar of Philosophy*. His new book, to which he has given the title of *Religion and Intellect* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net), is just as unswerving in attitude and unmistakable in aim. There are no secrets in science, and there are no mysteries in religion. No word has the least authority added to it by being found in the Bible or adopted by the Church. Every statement must be tested by the individual intellect, and by it declared to be truth or falsehood.

'Given a man who is determined to think to the best of his ability, and sooner or later you will find him arriving at sound conclusions. Ever shall judgment "return unto righteousness; and all the upright in heart shall follow it." Should you wish to hold that the majority of mankind are incompetent to think correctly about what chiefly concerns them, it would necessarily follow, let me point out, that they could not be justly amenable to Judgment. I demand the unanimous consent of intelligent beings to this proposition. Thus the responsibility of each person before God seems to be personal and untransferrable. The individual is

and must be the unit of moral or religious authority and responsibility as far as he himself is concerned; and thus it will be found that there is room for the exercise of the noblest powers and the loftiest wisdom in the humblest human Life.'

How does the Bible come out of this test? The New Testament comes out of it well, the Old Testament very badly. There are many passages in the Bible, says Mr. GRAHAM (but he finds them all in the Old Testament), 'which Reason rejects as utterly immoral, irreligious and intolerable. The Scripture says—"He that sacrificeth unto any God, but unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed" (Ex. xxii. 20). "And they entered into a covenant . . . that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be put to death, whether small or great, whether man or woman. And they sware unto the Lord with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets, and with cornets. And all Judah rejoiced at the oath" (2 Chron. xv. 12-15). Accept such laws and doings as Divinely authorised and you set up the most damnable warranties for religious persecution. It was such passages as these that, being received uncritically and irrationally, entangled even the noblest minds among the Reformers, and to some extent—nay, to a disastrous extent, blighted the Reformation.'

How does Faith come out of the test? Mr.

GRAHAM has no more trouble with Faith than with the Bible or the Church. He first discovers its meaning. 'As used by many people the word Faith is synonymous with sheer credulity. With the Romanist and the Ritualist, for example, it signifies a blind assent to ecclesiastical dogmas—the dogmas of what they are pleased to call the Catholic Church. The late Cardinal Newman, for instance, when he buried his doubts and difficulties in the Popish Temple of Infallibility, supposed that he had accomplished an act of Faith, whereas this most luctuose proceeding was not an act of Faith at all, but a most baneful act of nerveless credulity.'

Faith is not credulity. Nor is it mysticism. 'Your true born Anglican, with his easy indifference to logic and sound sense, will look upon The Thirty-nine Articles or "the Apostles' Creed" as the Faith without putting himself to the trouble of attaching any definite meaning to the words. Your Calvinist of the strictest sect will call it Faith to look upon the whole Human Race as lying naturally since "the Fall," in a state of Reprobation and Damnation. The region of Faith has become the region of mysticism—of intellectual Fogland.'

'What then,' he asks, 'is the true meaning of this tremendous word?' And answers: 'Faith might be properly defined as action inspired by love of moral principle and in conformity with a rational hope.'

For once the idea is not expressed in language of perfect lucidity. But its meaning is unmistakable. Faith is action, or at least a disposition to act, in accordance with knowledge. And the knowledge on which it acts is of course obtained by the exercise of the intellect. But there is an element of uncertainty in the act. For the knowledge is not complete. If the knowledge were complete, Faith would be indistinguishable from sight.

If we knew for certain that we should receive a

full reward for our act of Faith, it would be no more Faith, even though it involved some considerable self-denial. 'If it were a *verifiable fact* that the Martyr immediately goes to Bliss, there would probably be a great many candidates for martyrdom. If it were a *verifiable fact* that the Hero perishing in battle goes straight to Valhalla a few soldiers, probably, would seek to avoid the mortal shock. But the existence of Valhalla is not verified: *i.e.* not positively pressed upon any man's consciousness; consequently, when the Hero and the Martyr voluntarily perish, it is in the way of rational self-sacrifice—devotion to moral principle under the shadow and the pains of death intermingled with more or less hope in the Unverified Hereafter.'

Mr. GRAHAM ends with a definition. 'Faith is the disposition and determination to act in the moral field to the best of our ability in strict accordance with our knowledge and belief, and against difficulty and danger. More shortly—our Faith is our practical adherence to our principles. The amount of our Faith seems to be the amount of our practical adherence to our principles in all kinds of circumstances.'

'Dr. Denney's Theology' is the title of an article in *The Constructive Quarterly* for March. The author of the article is the Right Rev. W. P. PATERSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh and Moderator of the Church of Scotland.

The article contains an introduction and four divisions. The introduction describes the theological atmosphere of Scotland when Dr. Denney began to write. The first division touches upon his personal fitness for the writing of theology. The second brings out the main characteristics of his creed. The third takes the various items of that creed separately and estimates their worth for modern theology. And the fourth contains a criticism of Dr. Denney's theological position and consistency as a whole.

'Dr. Denney had brilliant gifts as well as varied and solid learning. An accurate classical scholar, a New Testament expert of the first rank, and adequately if not minutely versed in the history of doctrine, he was also thoroughly familiar with the spirit and the problems of modern philosophy, and he was withal a life-long student of great literature. As a stylist he is in a very high class. He had unrivalled command of pithy and picturesque English—his phrases seemed to have eyes, hands and feet, and it would not be easy to cite a better illustration of Masson's dictum that style is thought. His pages sparkle with felicitous and epigrammatic sayings.'

He was essentially an apologist, not a theologian. 'It is true that he resented being called an apologist. "The writer," he says in one of his books "disclaims any 'apologetic' intention. There is no policy in what he has written either in its matter or its substance. Nothing, so far as he is conscious, is set down for any other reason than that he believes it to be the truth." What he repudiated was, however, merely an accidental association of the term, and it is no injustice, but rather to his honour, to say that he was more than anything else an apologist whose chief purpose was to make the faith of the gospel intelligible, to maintain it by weighty argument, and to combat groundless prejudices and specious objections.'

He was not a systematic theologian. 'In some respects he had not the typical mind of the systematic theologian. The latter is a virtuoso in drawing distinctions, and Dr. Denney was constantly denying or blurring distinctions which are commonly taken for granted.' Thus he denied the distinction between biblical and dogmatic theology. 'They may be taught in separate rooms in a theological school, but except to the pedant or the dilettante the distinction between them is a vanishing one.' But the distinction, says Professor PATERSON, is quite sound. 'New Testament Theology is a historical discipline which reports upon the teaching of Jesus and His disciples.

Dogmatic Theology is a positive discipline which undertakes to unfold and defend a system of absolute truth.'

Professor PATERSON even thinks it possible to divide Dr. Denney's writings into the two classes of biblical and systematic theology. To biblical theology he would refer 'the famous monograph on *The Death of Christ—its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament* (1902). Dogmatics would be represented by the early and very notable *Studies in Theology* (1897), the posthumous Cunningham Lectures on the *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* (1917), and the supplement to the *Death of Christ* entitled *The Atonement and the Modern Mind* (1912).' The reason why Dr. Denney denied the distinction was that while his writings consisted mainly of New Testament theology, by personally appropriating and vindicating it he transmuted it into dogmatic theology.

Dr. Denney was not and did not desire to be a systematic theologian. He felt no call to fashion his theology into a complete architectural structure. He chose certain topics and aspects of doctrine because they seemed to him vital and interesting. For his interests were overwhelmingly religious, 'and he was rather impatient of problems which were wholly or mainly raised by the scientific and speculative instinct.'

He did not reach his conclusions by reasoning, but largely through intuition and feeling, 'and he trusted to commanding them, less by laboured trains of reasoning, than by vivid and trenchant utterance of what he believed and knew to be true. As a fact he was apt to suppose that when he had delivered himself of a decisive and scornful judgment, it had all the finality of a reasoned refutation.' Professor PATERSON ends the first division of his article with the words, 'In a general estimate one would say that, while he was above all a great apologist, he was at least in essentials a notable dogmatic theologian—possessed of the rare and invaluable qualification of religious genius and

theoretical insight, and employing an intellect which, if not markedly systematic, at least had a powerful grasp of principles, applied them with great consistency, and made every chapter and paragraph to live and thrill with searching and energizing thought.'

The second division gives an account of the contents of Dr. Denney's theology. But first of all of its foundation. 'Instead of reaffirming, in the old Protestant fashion, the absolute and exclusive authority of the Scriptures, he roundly declares that "the basis of all theological doctrine is experience." For this was the inheritance into which Dr. Denney was born. Professor PATERSON sketches the history of it in his introduction.

When the time came in Scotland that men could no longer believe in verbal inspiration, and the infallible authority of Scripture, two paths lay open before them. The one path was taken by the leading theologians of the Church of Scotland, the other by the leading theologians of the United Free Church. The one led to a philosophical type of theology, the other to an experiential.

Christianity, said Professor Caird and Professor Flint, is essentially a body of truths concerning God and His relations with the world and man; and it has a claim to be accepted on the ground of its essential reasonableness—as seen in part in its coincidence with the tenets of a sound philosophy, in part in its contribution of additional truths of impressive sublimity and power towards a final system of religious philosophy. It is a system, says Professor PATERSON, which would be fairly described as Rationalistic Supernaturalism. The other way was taken by Professor A. B. Davidson and Professor Robertson Smith. These men were repelled by any form of rationalism and based belief on the data and the witness of Christian experience. They said that whatever else one doubted 'there remains the inner life of the man who has tasted the grace of God in Christ; and in the convictions with which that inner life is

inextricably bound up there is an assurance, at least in regard to the capital doctrines of Christianity, which is independent of or supplementary to the witness of Scripture or Church.'

This, then, was the inheritance into which Dr. Denney was born. He was not born a Free Churchman, it is true. But the Church into which he was born—the Reformed Presbyterian Church—held rationalism in as much abhorrence as could any Free Churchman. And Dr. Denney was just twenty years of age when his Church became united with the Free Church.

The believer in Christ who builds his belief on the facts of experience is often charged by his opponents with disregard of the facts of history. And sometimes he is justly so charged. But not so Dr. Denney. 'The experience which he had in mind was one which is inseparably bound up with the historical revelation of God in Christ. "Religion," he says, "can no more be simplified by making it independent of history than respiration would be simplified by soaring beyond the atmosphere." His position was that when he interrogated the typical Christian experience, and especially his own evangelical experience, he found its essential content to be the possession of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, and an assurance of the reign and grace of the living Lord, accompanied by a willing and joyful acceptance of the recorded facts of His life, death and resurrection, and of the divine claims made by Him in the days of His flesh.'

Thus it was that the Scriptures possessed for him a priceless value. 'Upon them we are entirely dependent for our knowledge of the historical events without which there would be no Christian salvation available; by them the knowledge of Christ and of His Gospel is lodged in the mind; and further, if experience be the basis of theology, we inevitably reverence as the most precious of all documents, that express and interpret Christian experience, those writings which embody the

testimony of the Christians of the Apostolic Age.'

Such being the foundation of his faith, what were the contents of it? One sentence is sufficient to indicate all that he considered essential. He believed in the mediatorial work of Christ as including an atonement for the sins of the world.

In that sentence there are two things. First, Christianity is a mediatorial religion, the blessings of which are dependent on the work of Christ. Christianity, said Dr. Denney in his earliest book, entitled *Studies in Theology*, 'is a life in which faith is directed to Him as its object, and in which everything depends on the fact that the believer can be sure of his Lord. The main argument of the book is directed to show, "firstly, that from the very beginning Christianity has existed only in the form of a faith which has Christ as its object," and "for which everything in this life, especially in the relations of God and man, is determined by Him"; and, secondly, that the Christian religion, as the New Testament expounds it (*i.e.*, setting forth Christ as object of faith and mediator), "is sufficiently sustained by the underlying facts, and supported by the mind of Christ about Himself!" The central position and mediation of Christ is also the leading idea of the short creed propounded at the close of the book—"I believe in God through Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord and Saviour."

The other thing is that this mediatorial work of Christ is accomplished through an atonement for the sins of the world. 'Whether we call it a fact or a doctrine, the Atonement is that in which the differentia of Christianity, its peculiar and exclusive character, is specially shown; it is the focus of revelation, the point at which we see deepest into the truth of God, and come most deeply under its power. For those who recognize it at all, it is Christianity in brief; it concentrates in itself, as in a germ of infinite potency, all that the wisdom, power and love of God mean in relation to sinful men.'

Now it is here that Professor PATERSON finds not only the central fact in Dr. Denney's own faith, but also his most important contribution to the study of theology. Schleiermacher had already recognized the mediatorial work of Christ as that which distinguishes genuine from spurious or emasculated Christianity. Schleiermacher had even gone beyond that and seen the necessity for some atonement. But while Schleiermacher is content with an atonement which secures redemption, Dr. Denney insists upon an atonement which leads to reconciliation. What does that mean? It means that while to Schleiermacher redemption was essentially a change of religious attitude and spirit, to Denney reconciliation was a most solemn transaction on the part of a personal and transcendent God. It means that 'while Schleiermacher limited the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice to its moral influence on the believer, Dr. Denney insisted that an objective Atonement enters into the substance of the Gospel, and that reliance on it is a condition of a living Christianity.'

Where does Professor PATERSON stand here? He stands beside Professor Denney. He says truly enough that it would be absurd to speak of 'men who have held a purely subjective theory of the Atonement, from Abelard to Bushnell, as having forfeited their title to rank as Christians, or to say that as a consequence they imperilled their eternal salvation,' but he holds it true also that 'Christian thought has from the beginning ascribed to the atoning work of Christ an independent value for God, and that when faith in the forgiveness of sins is grounded on a finished work of Christ, Christianity more decisively fulfils its promise of speaking peace to the troubled conscience.'

But the fact of the atonement is one thing, the method of its operation is another. Was Christ in His death a substitute for man and for every man, or was He a representative of mankind, or had His death merely a certain moral value, sufficient to weigh with God against the weight of human sin? Here Professor PATERSON finds himself at a loss.

'Dr. Denney's view,' he says, is 'not easy to grasp, if indeed he held a consistent view from the beginning to the end of his teaching ministry. He sometimes used language which was easily interpreted to mean that he championed the so-called orthodox theory—that sinners of mankind had deserved extreme and everlasting punishment, that Christ took their place and was punished in their room and stead, whereby satisfaction was made to the divine justice, and that it was thus rendered possible for God, on their fulfilment of the annexed conditions of faith and repentance, to accept and treat as righteous the members of our guilty race. But upon this scheme Dr. Denney passed criticisms which, in spite of his expressions of sympathy with it on important points, had the effect of removing the key-stone of the old arch. He could not bring himself to say that Christ was punished, and that there was a transference or imputation of guilt or merit as between the Saviour and the saved, and without these principles the whole orthodox theory loses its coherence and stability. The truth is that Dr. Denney, while refusing to admit the distinction between the fact and the theory of the Atonement, made a laborious search for a satisfactory theory of the *modus operandi* of Christ's sacrifice in procuring the boon of reconciliation, found none which he could adopt in its entirety, and ended by proclaiming that no theory showed so deep spiritual insight as that of MacLeod Campbell, which even Professor A. B. Bruce had spoken of most disrespectfully, and which had been combated by Crawford and Hodge as a fantastic and pernicious novelty.'

It is amazing that we do not understand the Sermon on the Mount even yet. It is more than amazing, it is humiliating. But that we do not understand it yet is one of the things that the war has made perfectly plain to us.

Many attempts at interpretation have been made. But it can scarcely be said that two of them agree together. It might, however, be possible to gather them into two classes, the one (a large and

indifferent class) holding that it leaves the Christian open to engage in war if he chooses, the other (a smaller but much more earnest band) vehemently asserting that it makes it utterly and forever impossible for the follower of Christ to take any part in war.

Both classes cannot be right. Both are probably wrong. But it does not follow that the truth lies somewhere between them. It may be above them, right above them both. Perhaps we shall see that it is so.

The interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount has been attempted by some of the acute intellects in the history of the Church. But we need not recall their efforts. We ourselves are the heirs of all the ages, and if any light has been thrown in the past on the meaning of Christ's wonderful words, it may be counted certain that we have inherited it. What we shall consider are the contributions which have been made to its interpretation by the theologians of our own day.

First of all, it has been pointed out that the Sermon on the Mount was addressed to Oriental peoples. That point was made most emphatically by the late Principal T. M. LINDSAY of Glasgow. His best expression will be found in the volume of *College Addresses* published after his death. 'Jesus was an Oriental teacher,' says LINDSAY. 'Oriental teachers make large use of short parables, proverbs, and what are called apothegms or wise sayings—familiar to the people whom they are trying to instruct, and throw their teaching into that form. Oriental peoples can scarcely understand our direct and definite Western teaching. They are not accustomed to it. It is not familiar to them. The words fall on their ears—words quite plain and intelligible to us—and yet fail to make any impression on their understanding. So much is this the case that many a missionary has failed to make his hearers understand what we should call the plain truths of the Gospel till he has learned a collection of Arabic or Hindu

Chinese or Swahili proverbs and wise sayings; and when he has illustrated what he has to say by these familiar sayings, he has then been able to make the people understand him.'

Now the thing to observe about a proverb or popular saying is that 'it is seldom or never universally true, and does not hold good in every case. It is often an extreme instance of the universal truth which it teaches. So much is this the case that you may have wise sayings which are almost contradictory. You have an example in the Book of Proverbs (xxvi. 4): "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him"; and verse 5: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."

Well, says LINDSAY, 'the precepts about non-resistance belong to this class of wise sayings. They are all true. In most cases it is neither wise nor Christian to resist an ill done to us, or to go to law, or to refuse to help a neighbour. But what we have are extreme cases—instances in the extremest form to be imagined of the general principle of Christian love to our neighbour.' And with that interpretation Principal LINDSAY is satisfied.

But it is not sufficient. Entirely true as it is, it does not go all the way. Let us try another.

It has been said that the Sermon on the Mount is addressed to individuals. And so, no doubt, it is. But what is meant is that it is addressed to individuals as individuals and not as members of society. This is the point which Dr. James MARTINEAU in his *Essays and Addresses* attempts to make. 'Christ,' he says, 'demands the renunciation of revenge, which is personal, but does not interfere with the application of retribution, which is social. And this is no fanciful or unintelligible distinction. If the offender strikes me on the right cheek, I am to turn to him the other. But suppose he strikes my mother on the right cheek, am I to look on while he strikes her on the

left? Does the precept contemplate any such case? Does it prohibit the generous interposition which flings back insults directed against the innocent, and stands between the defenceless and their oppressor? Not in the least; and if it did, no argument could be heard to prove that such a religion was divine. No; these are simply maxims of *self-renunciation*; not renunciation of our brother's rights, of all struggle for the just and good, of all practical vindication of God's will. They suppose the case when only two persons are present on the scene—the *aggressor* and the *aggrieved*; and teach simply how to deal with the mere *hurt* inflicted on the sufferer's self-love; to suppress the resentment which promotes retaliation; to make no claim on *his own account* against the offender; but in the presence of higher ends to surrender himself to even further harm, and leave the award to a fitter tribunal than his own anger.'

This interpretation is accepted by Canon STREETER. He deals with the subject in the 20th number of the series entitled 'Papers for War Time.' Canon STREETER accepts Dr. Martineau's interpretation and applies it directly to war. "'Love your enemies,' said Christ. How can I be said to love those whom I will to bayonet? Is there not a confusion here? 'Your enemies,' in the text, means those who have done you a personal wrong. The individual soldier has no personal grudge against the individual in the trenches opposite. On occasion he will even fraternize with him. In war opposition is usually—there are, of course, exceptions—quite impersonal. It is the cause, not the individual enemy, that is fought against. If an innocent individual is acting as the instrument of an evil cause, it is better that he should die than that the evil cause should triumph—at least if the evil is on a sufficiently large scale. It is better that some thousands of Germans should die, fighting nobly for what *they* believe a just cause, than that millions of Belgians and Frenchmen should live for generations under a degrading tyranny. And the soldier

who causes their death does not act in hate. Soldiers rarely hate, they normally respect, their enemies, and respect is the beginning of love. "To-morrow," said a Saxon to an Englishman on Christmas Day, "I fight for my country, you for yours."

Of the same mind is Dean Hastings RASHDALL. In his volume entitled *Conscience and Christ*, Dr. RASHDALL argues, with Martineau and Streeter, that the Sermon on the Mount is addressed to individuals, and he carries the argument a step further. He carries it into politics. He says that the Sermon on the Mount applies to individuals in private life, and has nothing to do with politics or government.

But while Dr. RASHDALL holds that Jesus was never thinking of political problems—the people whom He was addressing having nothing to do with government or the administration of justice—he will not allow any one to draw the conclusion that the follower of Christ now has nothing to do with politics or social questions. 'The principles of ethics,' he says, 'whatever principles they are that we adopt, must necessarily be applicable to all spheres of life. Those who have accepted Christ's principles of conduct must necessarily, when they find themselves in power, regard them as their rule of action in their official or civil capacity as well as in their business life and their private affairs.'

And this at once enables us to see that it is not sufficient as an interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount to say that it is addressed to private individuals. There are no such individuals. In the time of our Lord it may be that those whom he addressed had no votes and could not be summoned to sit on juries, as Dean RASHDALL puts it. Yet they were living in a society just as we are, and could no more keep themselves isolated and apart from the claims of that society than we can. The question of war itself arose very soon. But from the very beginning there was the question,

'Who is my neighbour, and how am I to behave towards him?'

A more important point is made by Mr. C. V. EMMET in the volume of essays entitled *The Fair and the War*. 'The Sermon upon the Mount,' says Mr. EMMET, 'is addressed to those who are, or are understood to become, Christ's own followers. And it calls for considerable progress in Christian right living.' His argument accordingly is that outside the bounds of true Christianity you cannot apply the Gospel of the Sermon on the Mount, you must still be content with the Law. The Law, he says, 'must come before the Gospel in the sense that the principles of justice, honesty, truthfulness, and regard for the fair claims of others must be consistently applied before it is possible to think of non-resistance or a surrender of rights. To attempt to begin with these is not only futile but ethically wrong, since it is building without the necessary foundation.'

This position is taken also by Mr. H. L. GOUDE in *The War and the Kingdom*. 'The world very naturally finds an occasion of stumbling in our Lord's command not to be anxious about the morrow, but to imitate the insouciance of the birds and flowers. This teaching has been described as some of the most foolish and pernicious teaching ever given by a moralist. And so it would be were it addressed to all the world. But it is not addressed to all the world; it is addressed solely to His own followers, and it is bound up with the special relation in which they stand to God. Like Himself, they are to seek first God's Kingdom and righteousness; they are to be entirely devoted to God and to His service. They are not to be anxious about the things of this life, because, while they live wholly for God, He Himself will provide for their lower needs. But His teaching has no bearing either upon the individual or upon the corporate life of those who do not share His devotion to God, and He Himself implies this: "Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal

shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek."

All this is undeniable. But even this is not enough. Let us turn to a book written by one of the most suggestive thinkers and clearest writers of to-day, Mr. Oliver Chase Quick. The volume is entitled *The Testing of Church Principles* (Murray; 5s. net).

In the second chapter of that book Mr. Quick touches on the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. He touches it and no more. For his method always is to throw out a suggestion and pass on. His book is not on that account difficult reading. It can be read easily enough and quickly enough. But the reading of it is of no use; it must be studied. He does not mention any of the proposals for understanding the Sermon on the Mount which have been noticed here. He states at once, and in the fewest possible words, what he understands the true interpretation to be. And this is what he says.

'Christians,' he says, 'have been obstinately slow to understand that the Sermon on the Mount means the substitution, not of one code of rules for another, but of principles, which require thought to apply them, for rules, which appear to carry a self-evident application with them. The command to give alms seems to settle the question whether a particular beggar shall receive a shilling or not. The command "Thou shalt not kill" seems to settle at once the legitimacy of war, though few have been found to interpret it in its obvious sense. But the commands "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself" in themselves settle no such questions; there is no one kind of action which they enjoin in all circumstances. They are principles which must issue in everything we do, but their appropriate expression in act requires thinking and planning in addition to mere goodwill. Hence Christian freedom from bondage to outward commandments really makes a more exacting demand upon effort;

for it incorporates into the task of good living, not merely the obedience of the will, but the reasoning powers of the mind.'

Yes, that is the true interpretation. Our Lord laid down no rules of conduct for anybody. He offered principles of life for everybody, and for all circumstances. You may be a follower of His and you may not; the Sermon on the Mount applies to you all the same. It applies to you in private life and in public life; on the magistrate's bench not one whit the less imperatively than in the study or the workshop. Christ spoke immediately to those who were within hearing. No doubt some of them were, He desired that all of them should be, His followers. And He meant to gather them together into that great Kingdom of God which He came to this world to establish. But Christ was a universalist, the only complete universalist that ever lived, and every word He uttered has a universal application. He said, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' Yes, without exception; but before He was lifted up from the earth He addressed Himself to all men without exception.

For He uttered, not rules of conduct, but principles of life—rather one single principle of life, covering all nations, all individuals, and all opportunities of exercise. It is expressed in the one word 'love.' Have the spirit of love to your neighbour, have that in you, He said, and then exercise every faculty you possess in the application of it, as the opportunities of life appear.

But did He not give examples? Did He not tell those who heard Him how to conduct themselves if such and such circumstances should arise? Did He not say, 'If a man sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also'? Did He not say, 'Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also'?

These are not examples. They are simply

restatements of the principle. As examples of conduct they are absurd. They are incredible, impossible—all the ugly things that the enemies of Christ have been accustomed to call them. They are not, as they have been taken to be, typical cases according to which a man is to regulate his whole conduct and life. They are simply, we say, restatements of the all-comprehensive principle of love. And they are purposely expressed in an impossible form in order that it might never be possible to take them as examples.

Yet it is just as examples that we have always taken them, and thus landed ourselves in our present chaos of interpretation. There is no evidence, and we do not suppose for a moment, that the early disciples took them so. John understood the law of love and universally applied

it. But who has forgotten his encounter with Cerinthus? Paul understood it and applied it. But who has forgotten his encounter with Simon Peter? Peter himself understood it and exercised it as whole-heartedly as any of them. But who has forgotten his encounter with Simon Magus?

Words, words, you say. Yes, words: but words may cut as deep as deeds. And our Lord Himself did not withhold Himself from the act when it was necessary, even the aggressive act that day He turned the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. One hour you hear His cry, 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together'; the next His stern command, 'Take these things hence.' These were both the expression of the one all-comprehending principle of love.

The Christian Hope.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

IN these days many hearts are turning wistfully to the hope of the future life for consolation under the burden of bereavement and desolating sorrow. The secret of the consolation of this hope lies largely in the prospect it offers of reunion with those loved ones who counted not their own lives dear to them that they might secure the liberties and peace of others, and, under God, bring in a new day of truth and righteousness among the nations. What ground have we for cherishing with establishing and strengthening assurance such a hope and such a prospect? And can we with any degree of certainty and definiteness portray the nature of this future life, its circumstances and conditions?

I.

The hope itself is native to the heart of man. It is the natural and instinctive inclination of man always and everywhere to believe that beyond the tumult and the waste of death there is a continued personal existence. This instinctive or intuitive faith of the normal human heart can be analysed

into different elements or component factors with a view to showing its rationality or reasonableness. For one thing, there is the very character of the constitution of man's being, his make and mould, which has stamped on it the mark of the infinite and the eternal. That which is distinctive of man, differentiating him from the brute creation—his reason, his affections, his moral and spiritual consciousness—these all imply and demand a life beyond this world of time and sense. By endowing him with desires and aspirations after truth and love and holiness which are not fulfilled in the present, God hath set eternity in man's heart. And if these ambitions and aspirations are given him only to be for ever silenced by death, then not only is human life in its characteristic attributes and 'values' reduced to a mockery and illusion, but the whole long process of evolution which has issued in man ends in an irrational anti-climax, and thereby a fatal blow is struck at our belief in the very reasonableness of the universe. No wonder a well-known scientific writer, approaching the matter just from this point of view, is compelled

to confess, 'I believe in the immortality of the soul as a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work' (Fiske, *Destiny of Man*, p. 62). That for one thing. And for another this: the character of the world in which at present we have our being, the manifest incompleteness and imperfection of the present scene of things. This life with its abounding anomalies and enigmas, the apparently unjust incidence of suffering, for example, the sense of an unredressed balance of wrong in the arrangements of life and society, the sight too of tragically unfinished purposes and shattered hopes, the true and the good cut down when their life-work has often but begun—these and such like facts demand a future state in which the mysteries of the present shall be made clear, its moral tangle unravelled and rectified and a completion granted to noble lives broken off prematurely here.

Such arguments—usually spoken of as 'the philosophical arguments for immortality'—undoubtedly have their place and value, but they do not amount to proof of a future life. What they do is to analyse and rationally support a faith derived by other means; and history and literature are witnesses how little these 'natural intimations of immortality' can of themselves sustain an assured confidence in a future conscious existence or give comfort and peace in the prospect of it. The hope they beget is, as one of the greatest of the ancients confessed, but 'a frail raft'—'a raft upon which man sails through life not without risk, if he cannot find some word of God which will more surely and safely carry him' (Plato, *Phaedo*, 85). And the same applies to the more properly scientific arguments for immortality. Nothing, indeed, is more striking in this connexion than the change within recent years in the attitude of accredited science to this question. Whereas formerly it was the fashion for science, under the influence of materialistic assumptions as to the relations of mind and body, to deny or call in question the possibility of the survival of personality after the dissolution of the present body, the whole tendency of present-day science, with its increasing emphasis on the essential spirituality of matter, is to encourage rather than to discourage such a belief. But science equally with philosophy cannot afford real proof in this matter. There are, it is true, those who claim to-day to supply such positive proof by direct experimental evidence of

personal survival along the line of the investigations of Psychical Research. Now I will confess that in my judgment there is strong evidence for at least some cases of alleged 'communications' with the departed. But even if such 'communications' are admitted, they do not establish anything which satisfies the craving of the human heart for immortality. At best they testify only to a continuance or temporary survival of the spirit after the death of the body, not to such a survival as permanently conserves the moral and spiritual personality in its distinctive characteristics and values, which is the only immortality worth having. The investigations of Psychical Research by disclosing new possibilities in the spirit world may assist or corroborate belief in a future life by removing prejudices from the scientific side, thus at once clearing the ground for and making more reasonable such a belief. But real proof of and certainty for the belief in immortality must be sought in another direction than that of scientific or philosophical arguments. To find the 'surer word' which Plato desiderated, and which we must have if we are to venture our souls with confidence across 'the swelling flood,' we must turn to the specifically religious argument, namely, to a consideration of the revealed character and purpose of God.

II.

In the Old Testament faith in a future personal existence was felt to be involved in the very nature of religion as life in fellowship with God. The man whom God in His love has called into fellowship with Himself is His for ever. That God should call men into such a holy and blessed fellowship or friendship only to leave them at last in the dust—this for prophet and psalmist was an unthinkable contingency. That were to deny either the love of God or His power, making death and the grave stronger than He, and either alternative was impossible. No; fellowship with the eternal Father, it was felt, must be itself eternal. It was the energizing conviction of this that made the minds of the highest souls among the Old Testament saints overleap death and the grave, and trust themselves into the hands of the Father Almighty. 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right

hand there are pleasures for evermore.' It was to this fundamental religious conviction, this Old Testament bed-rock of faith in a future life, that Jesus Himself appealed in His argument with the Sadducees to justify belief in a continued personal existence. 'As for the dead being raised,' He said, 'have ye not read in the book of Moses how God said to him, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. He is not the God of dead people, but of living. Ye do greatly err.'

But while this is the ground-basis of the Scriptural faith in a future personal life—the love of God to the individual involved in the religious relationship—it is only in the New Testament and in and through Christ that we have the final pledge and assurance of the certainty of it. And that in this way. Jesus is the crowning example of the man who has trusted God and lived in fellowship with Him. He lived with God as a Son with the Father all the days of His life. In the experience of Jesus, therefore, in contact with death and the grave we have the great test case, what scientists call the 'crucial instance,' of death's reaction on a life lived in fellowship with the Father. Here is a life which, it would seem, closed prematurely so far as earth was concerned. In the prime of His strong and holy manhood, at the age of thirty-three, He, the Son of God, made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of truth and righteousness. It is history's crowning instance of the seeming disaster of a noble and promising life tragically cut short. But Easter morning proved once and for all that over this world of griefs and graves there rises the love of a Heavenly Father, stronger than death, which will not suffer the life of filial fellowship with Him to be destroyed, and which even through the suffering and sacrifice of a seemingly premature death can work out His great and mighty purpose for the world's redemption. This is what makes the Resurrection of Jesus not indeed the basis of our faith in the future life, but the final pledge and assurance of the certainty of it. Even before the Resurrection, as we have seen, there were those who had laid hold of the conviction as involved in the very nature of religion that they whom God has loved and called into filial fellowship with Himself cannot be left for ever in the dust. But, as it has been said, it is one thing to know that spring is coming because the almanac tells us so; it is quite another

thing some April day to feel upon the brow a gust of vernal air telling us that spring is actually come. And what the Resurrection of Jesus does is to reveal the future life in actual being, to exhibit it to show the promise of victory over death and the grave as fulfilled and verified in Him, and thus to bring life and immortality to light. 'In Christ,' as Augustine puts it, 'immortality is no longer a hope but a fact.' Were it not for the Resurrection, faith in immortality would still be but a promise, a hope unverified. Other raisings from the dead, indeed, are recorded for us in the Gospels as wrought by Jesus Himself—the raising of Lazarus, of the son of the widow of Nain, and of Jairus' daughter—but these were simple revivifications, cases of mere restoration to the same conditions of life as before, again at some future time to face death and the grave. But not so in the case of Jesus. 'He being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more hold over him.' He has vanquished death, and so become 'the firstfruits of them that sleep.' And in His Resurrection we have not only the decisive confirmation and illustration of victory over death, we have also the very pledge and ground of the Christian's resurrection. Through Christ and in virtue of His crucified but now risen power we are brought into a new life of reconciled fellowship with the Father; and this life in fellowship with a risen Saviour—life in the Spirit—guarantees the resurrection triumph to all believers. 'For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him.' So that the Apostle as he contemplates death, so far from shrinking at the thought of it, greets it with a shout of exultant, triumphant joy: 'O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?' 'I am persuaded that neither death nor life . . . nor things present, nor things to come . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' And the man who believes, with the Apostle, in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, must go on to say also, in the great words of the Apostolic Creed, 'I believe in the life everlasting.'

III.

But what, we ask, of the nature of the life to come? It is a natural yearning and craving of the human heart to 'go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan.' Have we any data, or

acts, to warrant us portraying with any definiteness or certainty the nature and conditions of this life beyond death? There are many to-day, among them some of the noblest and most serious of souls, who by investigations along the line of Psychical Research seek to lift the veil and peer into the future world. They take promise of the dying that, if they can, they will send back messages from across the gulf. But any messages or communications alleged to be received in this way cannot be said to be either spiritually or intellectually edifying, in the way of adding to our helpful knowledge of the other world. After all, there is only One who has gone over the sea for us and has returned, and we are on safe ground only when we follow His guidance. But even in the case of Christ, when we ask what He has told us about life beyond the tomb, we have to acknowledge at first a sense of disappointment that He has revealed so little on the subject, He who alone could speak with full and certain knowledge where all others can only guess or speculate. It may be that this Divine reserve of Christ was rendered necessary by the impossibility of making the future life and the glory of it intelligible to understandings limited as ours are at present. But however this may be, we have always to remember that Divine revelation has been given not to gratify our curiosity, but to show us the path in which we may walk now with assured and certain hope. And on this matter as on others just so much has been revealed as is sufficient for our guidance in the present, to enable us to tread across the distances in quietness and in confidence. On the basis of what Christ has revealed, however, by His word and life and Spirit we are justified in making the following assertions:

1. The future life will be a life of *embodied existence*, not that of disembodied spirits. This is the distinctive position of the Christian hope, a position which carries with it the assurance not only of the continuance of personal identity, but also of the satisfaction of that craving which has been called 'the most passionate and pathetic yearning of human nature,' the craving for mutual recognition in the after-world. And few things are more striking or significant than the way in which present-day science is increasingly supporting and corroborating the Christian position. It is not that the very same body that has been committed to the dust—blown to fragments it may be on

the battlefield or gone down to a watery grave—is to be raised again from the dead. This is neither the scientific nor the Christian affirmation. 'What you sow,' says the Apostle, 'is not the body that is to be' (1 Co 15³⁷). 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (v.⁵⁰). Even here the body is continually changing, and its identity consists not so much in the material particles of which it is composed as in the 'soul' or 'spirit' which through all material changes is the animating and organizing principle of the whole. The risen body if continuous with the body of earth is yet this body so transfigured and transformed as to be free from all earthly elements of weakness and corruption and decay; so transfigured and transformed indeed that the Apostle calls it a 'spiritual' body (v.⁴⁴)—not because it is less than before material, but because in it matter is wholly and finally subjugated to spirit, so that it has become a fitter and more adequate instrument of spiritual purpose than the body of earth. The nature of this 'spiritual' body we may be unable to understand. But we have the pledge of it, and the first-hand look at it, in the risen glorified body of Christ, a body changed and transformed from that of earth, yet in and through which the identity of the personality was able to manifest itself. And for us at present it is enough to know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him who is 'the First-born of the dead.' 'If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you,' that they may be 'conformed to the body of his glory.'

2. The future life will be a life of *continued but unimpeded activity and service*. The heavenly life is indeed a life of rest. 'They rest from their labours,' saith the voice from heaven (Rev 14¹³). The word 'labours' in the original Greek carries with it a sense of weariness, of spentness, of exhaustion—'wan and drooping, like a stricken plant.' And entry on the heavenly life means redemption from the drooping and the wanness, and entrance into the tireless, never-withering life:

There everlasting spring abides
And never-withering flowers.

The redeemed of the Lord will gather home weary with their journey, and wounded, it may be, with their sore warfare; and there they will find rest

and healing, like King Arthur in the island valley of Avalon :

Where falls not hail or rain, or any snow,
Nor ever wind blows loudly; but it lies
Deep meadow'd, happy, fair with orchard leaves
And bowery hollows crowned with summer sea,
Where I will heal me of my grievous wound.

But this rest of the heavenly life is not a rest of mere ecstatic inactivity or passivity. It is a rest of glorious harmonious activity. - 'They rest from their labours, *for* their works follow with them' (R.V.). It is a striking collocation. There is a contrast between the two words, 'labours' and 'works.' The labours of the redeemed end in the grave; there the element of weary struggle and painful effort is left behind for ever. 'They shall rest from their labours'—from the laboriousness thereof—but not from their works, 'for their works follow with them,' in their methods and resultant capacities and habits they remain and go with them into their new life. As Milton nobly puts it :

Thy works and alms and all thy good endeavour
Stood not behind nor in the grave were trod,
But as faith pointed with her golden rod
Followed them up to joy and bliss for ever.

We shall carry with us into the future, that is to say, not our characters only but our capacities and powers, those powers and capacities which we have acquired through honest effort and service here: There we shall resume the work for which we have qualified ourselves here, only there it will be no longer checked and hampered by the struggles and failures of our mortal life. Have we not here a ray of light on the mystery of earth's unfinished lives, so many thousands of them in this day of awful struggle cut off in the very prime of their manhood? When the old and the spent are gathered home we do not murmur or complain; but when youth falls in life's morning, when the strong are cut off in their strength and that in such desolating numbers, we are dumb oftentimes before the mystery and the strangeness of it. But this is the word of promise: 'His servants serve him,' there as well as here. Their work is not done; in ways beyond our thinking it is going forward still.

3. This life in the future world, though thus harmonious and satisfying, will be a life of *varied glory*, a life where there will be differences of honour and reward according to the quality of our

service here. This is a part of Christ's teaching which perhaps has not been given its proper place in our thoughts of the after-life. To Zebedee's sons who requested the place of honour in the heavenly kingdom, Jesus replied, 'To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it hath been prepared by my Father.' It is a matter, that is say, not of mere arbitrary personal favour: it depends on fitness (Bruce in *E.G.T.* on Mt 20²). Places of honour are not bestowed, they are won: they go to those who are fit to receive them, those who have prepared themselves for them by sacrifice and service here along the line of Christ's sacrifice and service. 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I am about to drink?' And in the 'money parables' of our Lord—the parables of the 'talents' the 'pounds' and the 'pennies'—we have a more detailed indication of the principles on which apportionment is made. Shall not they who have given their lives in suffering and sacrifice to the last full measure of surrender for the redemption of the nations from untruth and unrighteousness go before in heavenly honour and glory those who while Christ's professing followers, have counted the cost and thought it too great to pay? 'These are they which come out of the great tribulation.'

A life of transformed embodied existence, of unimpeded activity and of varied glory. And for the rest, the Master Himself has pledged His word for it that no true instinct of the human heart shall last be doomed to disappointment. 'If it were not so, I would have told you'—the wonderful frankness of the loving Saviour. Only a parenthesis this in the midst of one of His great teachings, but a parenthesis of such singularly meaningful significance as to carry with it more assurance than the most elaborate of arguments. 'If it were not so, if the cherished dreams and hopes of the human heart were to be disappointed, 'I would have told you.' 'In my Father's house are many mansions, many abiding places, and I go to prepare a place for you.' Just as when a little child is born into the world it comes to a place made ready for it by the thousand little thoughtfulnesses of a tender mother's care, so if we are in Christ' death will but usher us into a place and a sphere prepared for us by Divine redemptive love, that we and ours may abide with Him forever.

So then—this is what by the grace of God it comes to—amid all the racking agony and bereavement of the present we have a hope that ‘putteth not to shame.’ It is some lightening of the grief of those who are bereaved to know that their loved ones died well and nobly in a great cause, a cause which is the very cause of God Himself; that they gave what they had to give, and gave it freely, keeping nothing back. This in itself is much, but it is not all. Christ has sanctioned the hope and given it a sure ground of verification that separation from our loved ones is only for a time. In the heavenly home are gathered by the grace of God the brave who loved us and died for us. God has through sacrifice and death taken their lives back to Himself, and we shall find them

again in the Father’s presence. And if among those who have died in this manner there are some whose lives have seemed unhopeful and unpromising, we remember that it was the Saviour and the Lord Himself who said to the dying thief, ‘To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.’ If this was said to such an one, whose life was touched even in the circumstance of death to more serious issues, what shall we say of those who even if they knew it not were filling up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ for the sake of a sinful and needy world? Who can tell how many of them have through the struggle and the sacrifice, it may be in the very moment of making the last full surrender, thrown open their lives to the saving energy of God?

Literature.

UNCLE REMUS.

THE biography of the creator of Uncle Remus, a creation that appeals equally to childhood and old age, has been written by his daughter-in-law, Mrs. Julia Collier Harris. The title is *The Life and Letters of Joel Chandler Harris* (Constable; 18s. net). Why was it not written by one or other of his own large family, so many of whom had the literary gift, a gift, moreover, that was so carefully fostered by their father? The reading of the book seems to say that, one and all, they gave way to their eldest brother’s wife, because she had the gift in greater measure. It is easy enough to see that it was not an easy biography to write. Arresting incidents in the life of Joel Chandler Harris were rare, and there was nothing supremely attractive either in his outward appearance or in his inner personality. Yet the biography is an unmistakable success, most interesting throughout and even deeply impressive.

The biographer had one advantage. Joel Chandler Harris was a writer of letters. An extremely awkward and sensitive country lad, he sought refuge from the very beginning in the writing of letters, and when he had confidence in his correspondents he wrote them at length and intimately. There is especially a long series of

letters written in later life to his children at school, which are almost enough of themselves to be the making of a biography.

Sensitiveness was the stake in his flesh all through life. ‘With some people,’ he says, ‘the quality of sensitiveness adds to their refinement and is quite a charm. With me it is an affliction—a disease—that has cost me more mortification and grief than anything in the world—or everything put together. The least hint—a word—a gesture—is enough to put me in a frenzy almost. The least coolness on the part of a friend—the slightest rebuff tortures me beyond expression, and I have wished a thousand times that I was dead and buried and out of sight.’ ‘I have a suspicion sometimes,’ he says again, ‘that it is the result of some abnormal quality of the mind—a peculiarity, in fact, that lacks only *vehemence* to become downright insanity. I have been convinced for many years that the difference between lunacy and extreme sensitiveness is not very clear. Like the colours of the prism, they blend so readily that it is difficult to point out precisely where the one begins and where the other leaves off.’ When he became famous, concert-managers, including the redoubtable Major Pond, tempted him with large offers of money to give readings from his own books. But in vain.

Mark Twain describes his first meeting with him. 'We were able to detect him among the crowd of arrivals at the hotel counter by his correspondence with a description of him which had been furnished us from a trustworthy source. He was said to be undersized, red-haired and somewhat freckled. He was the only man in the party whose outside tallied with this bill of particulars. He was said to be very shy. He is a shy man. Of this there is no doubt. It may not show on the surface but the shyness is there. After days of intimacy one wonders to see that it is still in about as strong force as ever. There is a fine and beautiful nature hidden behind it, as all know who have read the Uncle Remus book; and a fine genius, too, as all know by the same sign. I seem to be talking quite freely about this neighbor: but in talking to the public I am but talking to his personal friends, and these things are permissible among friends. He deeply disappointed a number of children who had flocked eagerly to Mr. Cable's house to get a glimpse of the illustrious sage and oracle of the nation's nurseries. They said:—

"Why, he's white!"

'They were grieved about it. So, to console them, the book was brought, that they might hear Uncle Remus's Tar-Baby story from the lips of Uncle Remus himself—or what, in their outraged eyes, was left of him. But it turned out that he had never read aloud to people, and was too shy to venture the attempt now. Mr. Cable and I read from books of ours, to show him what an easy trick it was; but his immortal shyness was proof against even this sagacious strategy, so we had to read about Brer Rabbit ourselves.'

There is much humour throughout the book and very pleasant humour it is, just the kindly sympathetic humour of Uncle Remus himself. And the root of it was religion. 'His religion,' says one of his friends, 'pervaded his whole life, as health pervades a strong man's body. It was more of an atmosphere you felt than a distinct entity you could describe. His home was filled with it. You could never enter his door without a sense of a subtle, genial presence resting on everything about the home. Every child he had did seemingly as he pleased, but grew up to express, in orderly conduct and attention to duty, the sweet music of his father's house, to which he had adjusted himself almost unconsciously.'

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The student of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit needs guidance. There are books in abundance. But it is neither the abundance nor the dearth of books that makes the difficulty. It is the demand for discrimination. For on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit there are two kinds of books, the good and the bad. And the good books are very good and the bad books very bad. It is a doctrine on which a writer is either right or wrong; there is no middle way.

For a long time the bad book predominated. Now the good book prevails. And the latest is one of the very best. It comes from India. Its author is the Rev. J. F. Edwards, one of the editors of *Dnyanodaya*, the English and Marathi organ of five missions in India. Mr. Edwards has written the book for India as well as in India. But that simply means that the student of the Holy Spirit in India needs the same kind of book as the student elsewhere. There is nothing provincial, local, or temporary about it.

Mr. Edwards has made up his mind on most of the problems connected with the Holy Spirit, and when he has not he says so. He has not made up his mind on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the living Christ, because he does not believe that that problem is explained in the New Testament. But the feature of his book of most prominence is the use made in it of the literature on the Holy Spirit—literature which the author knows well and judges accurately. He has the gift of exposition. And ever as the exposition proceeds it is illuminated by some quotation.

The book is published by the Christian Literature Society for India. The title is *The Holy Spirit the Christian Dynamic*.

THE CENTURY OF HOPE.

The Century of Hope is the title which Mr. F. S. Marvin has given to his sketch of Western Progress from 1815 to the Great War (Clarendon Press 6s. net). It is more than a history of the hundred years which it covers. It is an interpretation. No doubt history must always be interpretation, but Mr. Marvin sets out to trace the evolution of the ideals which took possession of men's minds rather than to record the external events which affected their material well-being. As it is inter-

eration, history must always be subject to the historian's personality, and Mr. Marvin does not escape impressing himself, his own outlook and ideals, upon his work. But it does not seem possible for any one to accuse him of narrow-mindedness, still less of deliberate over-statement or suppression. The supreme test is the chapter on Religious Growth, and he emerges from that temptation as victoriously as from any other.

What does he find characteristic of the Century of Hope in religion? He finds first of all a better scholarship than ever before. He finds, further, recognition of the immediate presence and voice of God. 'To one school it is the voice within us a Universal Spirit, "more deeply interfused" than man can be in all the phenomena of the universe. To another it is the Human Spirit itself, not to be identified with the external world, but rising up from an unknown infinity behind us with infinite capacities before. But in taking self-consciousness in either sense as the final note of our review of religious growth, we are in full accord with the whole trend of modern philosophy since Descartes.' In the third place, he finds that the individual has discovered other individuals; he does not stand alone. 'Self-centred in one sense we must be, but not self-contained, and of all the achievements of recent religious thought we could perhaps put first the wider, the more social self. The same century has seen the attainment of the highest point in both conceptions, superficially opposed, inherently but two aspects of the same thing, a completely developing self-consciousness or personality, and a humanity from which that self derives its depth and fullness and with which it is constantly striving to make itself more equal.'

The title is curiously, perhaps we should say, everlastingly, chosen. The Century of Hope ended in the Great War.

MUHAMMADANISM.

The Christian Approach to Islam is the title which Mr. James L. Barton, Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, has given to his book on Muhammadanism (Pilgrim Press; \$2). The book contains the fifth series of the College of Missions Lectures delivered in Indianapolis, Indiana. It is a volume which enjoys all the interest and

delivery of the experienced lecturer, and the loss of the speaking voice is compensated for by the use of illustrations. It is perhaps as pleasant an introduction to the study of Muhammadanism and the right attitude of the Christian towards it as one could find. For not only can the author write pleasantly, he can also write authoritatively. He has studied Muhammadanism thoroughly, in both its words and its works. There is, he tells us, a good deal of dissatisfaction among educated Muslims in the present day. The causes of this dissatisfaction are many. He enumerates fifteen different causes. Perhaps the deepest of all and the most insurmountable is that the Koran is full of detailed commands, full of prohibitions and legalistic and casuistic provisions. The result is that 'already Islam has become largely a service of the lips and obedience to unalterable religious exactions, in which there is little place for the exercise of the spirit of personal devotion and where none is required.' How different all this is from the method of our Lord. How different is our inheritance.

Mr. Barton tells us that the chapter on God in his volume has been contributed by Professor G. A. Barton, the eminent Semitic scholar. It is a chapter of very great value and interest. Professor Barton brings out two things as characteristic above all else of the Muslim doctrine of God. One is that God is absolute sovereign, whence that fatal belief in fate which every one discovers in the Turk. The other is that God is not a God of love and knows nothing about it.

COLONEL REPINGTON.

Lieut.-Colonel Charles A. Court Repington, C.M.G., Commander of the Order of Leopold and Officer of the Legion of Honour, has written his autobiography. At least he has written the first volume of it. In this first volume he has carried his story down to the outbreak of the Great European War. We shall look forward with some expectation to the issue of the second volume. The title he gives the book is *Vestigia* (Constable; 21s. net).

It is not exactly an elevating book, though there is no denying the interest of it. Colonel Repington can write, and he goes slashing along without particular concern for anybody's feelings, and certainly without regard to any one's rights of

reverence or honour. He is so familiar with, or at any rate he talks so familiarly about, those whom the world at present delights to honour, that we have sometimes an uneasy feeling that we have been lifting our heroes on to pedestals.

Take an example. 'We were allowed to send officers abroad on official missions, and one fine day there walked into my room, in quest of employment, a smart, good-looking young officer, Captain Douglas Haig of the 7th Hussars, who was an acquaintance of mine. He did well in his first mission, which was, I think, to Italy, and so I sent him out again, this time to report on the French cavalry school at Saumur. Haig did this work extraordinarily well, and I sent in his report with most flattering remarks upon it. The result was that he became A.D.C. to the Inspector of Cavalry, so that I may fairly say that I obtained for the future Commander-in-Chief of our Armies in France his first Staff job.'

The book is full of anecdotes and incidents, in all of which Colonel Repington can say *magna pars fui*, which is quite right and proper in an autobiography, but some of them are—well, just a little difficult to digest. We do not mean to suggest that the book is full of tall stories, but there are stories in it, and Colonel Repington lets them take their chance with us. Speaking of the Battle of Omdurman, he says: 'Kitchener was extraordinarily calm during the battle. He had very slight knowledge of tactics, which he left to Hunter and Gatacre. When I asked him a few days before the battle, how he proposed to attack, he replied that he had brought us 1500 miles into Africa and had fed us, and that he expected us to fight the battle for him.'

Colonel Repington confesses that in his youth he was accounted 'cheeky.' He is less 'cheeky' with Kitchener than with any of our heroes. His picture of him, drawn in the Sudan War, is of a man who held himself apart from other men, solitary and self-sufficing; but the suggestion undoubtedly is that it would have been better for him and the campaign if he had been less aloof and abrupt. Speaking of Kitchener's abruptness, he says: 'There is a story, and it may be true, that on one occasion when the army marched out furtively into the night on a sudden order, Colonel Walter Kitchener, the *mudir* of our transport, an excellent officer but deaf, remained asleep during the flitting. He laid down in the midst of the

army, and awakened to find himself alone with the vultures. It is quite possible. All things were possible in the desert and with K.'

By the way, Colonel Repington writes on the whole good English. But notice in the story just quoted his inability to distinguish between the verb *lay* and the verb *lie*. There is another a funnier example of it. In the translation of a letter written by the present ex-Kaiser to Edward Sullivan he makes the Kaiser say about a certain vessel that 'she lays on the water like a swan.'

Colonel Repington has been a newspaper correspondent for a great many years, but he has an opinion of newspapers.

THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

Mr. William Harbutt Dawson, the author of many books on modern Germany, has now undertaken a consecutive history of *The German Empire* from 1867 to 1914. It is to be published in two volumes, the first of which is already issued (All & Unwin; 16s. net).

Mr. Dawson is better than his word. He began his history long before 1867, as early indeed as 1866, and he has gone half through the volume before he has reached the date he promised to start from. No doubt he found it necessary to trace the origins of events, and especially the making of that atmosphere which immediately preceded the Franco-Prussian War.

But it is undoubtedly when we reach the year 1867 that we become most deeply interested in the history. The author himself becomes more deeply interested then. And, as we proceed, one thing is brought out with unanswerable clearness: the fact that France was taken by surprise. Bismarck was preparing for war and had already determined upon it: Napoleon was working earnestly for peace. It is true that when Lebrun came back from Austria with a rebuff, Napoleon did not tell even the head of his Cabinet with what message Lebrun had returned. But that was not because he also was plotting mischief; it was because of his disappointment and his fear. Even a German historian, Ottokar Lorenz, admits that 'it is justifiable to regard as honestly intended Napoleon's professions of peace at the end of 1869 and the programme of the new Ollivier Ministry.'

One of the first public acts of Daru, the ne-

French Premier, 'was a proposal that France should invite Prussia to join in a measure of partial disarmament, as a means of relieving the tension between the two Powers and of convincing the rest of Europe that it was their wish and intention to be good neighbours.' Of course Bismarck rejected it. But so little suspicion was there of the working of Bismarck's mind that the French War Minister, when he introduced the army estimates for 1871 announced 'a reduction of 10,000 in the levy of new men, as Count Daru had promised earlier in the year. Recalling later the Government's action, M. Blondeau, director of the administrative services at the Ministry of War, stated that when in May he asked for a certain date the Minister made a "lively scene," and declared that "since the *plébiscite* the Government is absolutely bent on peace and there was no suspicion of war." As with the Government, so with the Emperor personally. The Earl of Clunesbury relates a conversation which he had in Paris with Napoleon on May 19th, in which the Emperor "observed that Europe appeared to be in quiet," and he comments: "It was evident to me that at that moment he had no idea of the coming hurricane which suddenly broke out in the first week of June."

We forget that in 1914 the Emperor of Germany and his advisers had Bismarck's methods and the successful result of them before them, and we blame the Allied Governments for not knowing that the war was at hand.

BRITISH SOCIALISM.

Mr. M. Beer, the author of *A History of British Socialism* (Bell; 12s. 6d. net), is an Austrian. Mr. R. H. Tawney, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, who introduces the book, tells us this with an apology, rather with pride. 'At a time,' he says, 'when to speak of the unity of Europe seems a jest, a work like that of Mr. Beer, the history of an Austrian scholar of the English contribution to an international movement, is not only a valuable addition to historical knowledge, but a reminder that there are intellectual bonds which exceed the War and which will survive it.' Mr. Beer has of course spent much time in this country. It is a surprising if not a humiliating thing to learn that this, the only thoroughly scientific and satisfactory history of socialism in this country,

has been written by a foreigner. Mr. Beer himself would tell us that it is part of the illogicality of the English intellect, part of that haphazard way we have of leaving things alone till some one else forces them upon our attention. But it is pleasant to see that a scholar of Mr. Tawney's reputation has no jealousy and does not even express any disappointment. It is enough for him that the work, when it has been done, has been done well. More than that, 'A foreign scholar,' he says, 'has certain advantages in writing the history of modern England. He is not scorched by the embers of living controversies. He is free from the prejudices of sect or party, and can view his subject through plain glass. The snares of ready-made interpretations are not about his feet, nor conventional judgments upon his lips. His eye for the sharp outline of facts has not been dimmed by a haze of familiar words. He can find a new significance in the obvious and still be surprised at what is surprising.'

This is all in the spirit of true patriotism, which asks the question not to what country does a scholar belong, but what qualifications has he for the work he has undertaken. And of Mr. Beer's qualifications Mr. Tawney has no doubt. 'Only scholarship,' he says, 'of a high order can give him the learning needed to compose a work like the present volume, and only long familiarity can save him from misinterpreting the atmosphere of a foreign nation. Mr. Beer possesses both. He is an indefatigable student, who knows the social history of England from the middle of the eighteenth century, as it is known only to Professor Graham Wallas, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb, and Mr. and Mrs. Hammond. And his twenty years of residence in England have given him the working acquaintance with the unstated assumptions of English political life which is hardly less necessary than historical knowledge for the task which he has undertaken.'

This is the first volume of the work. The second will carry the story of British socialism into the present century. It seems to have been well on the way when the war broke out, but the outbreak of the war sent its author into other duties. The first volume is therefore published separately, and it is complete in itself and furnished with its own index. It carries the history of socialism in Great Britain down to the rise of Chartism.

The author has a good command of the English

language. He is not content to offer a dry chronicle of events. He has the gift of imagination. He never counts his space wasted by a quotation from Wordsworth.

THE STATE IN PEACE AND WAR.

The war, we have often been told, was a war, not of nations, but of ideals. We have also been told that in the one ideal the State was supreme over conscience, and in the other conscience was supreme over the State. The antagonism was often otherwise expressed, but usually came to that. But such undiluted contrasts are rarely true to fact. That to the German mind, or at any rate to the German military mind, the State was supreme over all things is undeniable. But that, let us say, the British and American ideal was the supremacy of the conscience is far from demonstration. Let the conscientious objector tell us how far. We need to study the subject. We need to give it far more study than we have ever given it. We need to study the whole relation of the State to the individual and of the individual to the State.

Now for that purpose there is no better book than Professor John Watson's *The State in Peace and War* (Maclehose; 7s. 6d. net). With that ringing clearness of statement for which Professor Watson is famous, every problem is placed before us briefly enough to be compassed if not always wholly comprehended. For no doubt some problems are still open to discussion. One is the relation between public and private morality. Let us hear what Professor Watson says about that.

'Machiavelli,' he says, 'is no doubt right in maintaining that there is a distinction between public and private morality, and that a patriotic statesman may do many things which in a private individual would call for severe reprobation. But it is one thing to say that a nation, responsible for the whole life and prosperity of the subjects, cannot be judged in the same way as we judge an individual in his comparatively limited sphere of action, and another thing to say that it is absolved from all moral law and may employ fraud, deceit, treachery and violence under all circumstances and as a regular principle of action. Nor can a statesman be exonerated if he employs as a settled policy such methods to secure the aggrandisement of his own people, and even apart from any real danger to the existence of the nation.'

JAPANESE BUDDHISM.

The Charles F. Deems Lectureship of Philosophy in the University of New York may not be so well known in Great Britain as some other American Lectureships, but it has great names and good books attached to it. The first series was delivered by Principal Iverach, and was published under the title of 'Theism in the Light of Present Science and Philosophy.' Other lecturers have been Professor Borden P. Bowne, Dr. Horace G. Underwood, Sir W. M. Ramsay, Professor Eucken and Principal Fairbairn. The author of the latest series is August Karl Reischauer, M.A., D. Phil. Professor of Philosophy and Systematic Theology in Meiji Gakuin, Tōkyō, Japan. The title of the volume as published is *Studies in Japanese Buddhism* (Macmillan; \$2).

The lectures are seven in number, so arranged that they cover the whole subject without serious overlapping or omission. The first lecture deals with Buddhist origins; the second traces the development of primitive Buddhism into Mahāyāna Buddhism, that form of Buddhism which is most prevalent in Japan; in the third lecture the historical development of Buddhism in Japan itself is described; the fourth discusses the Buddhist Canon; the fifth sketches the Japanese sects; in the sixth there is an estimate of Buddhist ethics; in the seventh Buddhism and Christianity in Japan are brought into contrast.

Professor Reischauer has no very exalted idea of the value of Buddhism in Japan. Speaking of woman, for example, he says that Buddhism has done comparatively little for woman, much less than woman has done for Buddhism. Still he finds that it has made some contribution to the religious life of Japan and that in three ways.

'First of all, Buddhism elevated and enlarged the conception of the Divine. Shintō was a rather puerile animism and crude polytheism, and the Japanese had not yet advanced to the idea of a universal or the monistic whole. The elements of monism or monotheism found in present-day Shintō were not there when Buddhism first reached these shores; for, as we have said above, not until Buddhism had made itself felt was there even an attempt made to build up the various legends and myths of the native religion into a connected and reasoned whole. But it is the very breath of the philosophy of Mahāyāna Buddhism to reduce

urality of being to an all-embracing Divine whole, and to regard the myriads of gods and individual beings as in some way the expression of the All-One.'

'Secondly, Buddhism greatly enlarged the conception of man's destiny. The early Shintō ideal went very little beyond the conception of man as creature of sense-experience. The gods were explored or propitiated in order that they might stow upon the suppliant what he wanted for a prosperous and happy existence. And the happiness of existence lay not so much in the realm of enriched personality, as in the realm of those things which satisfy the desires of the senses. That lay beyond the realm of sense or the point of time when the sense organs are dissolved in death, did not concern the early Shintōist so much. Buddhism, however, taught Japan that man's present life is but a moment of his existence and that the real life is more than the life of the body.'

'A third great contribution which Buddhism made to the religious life of Japan is the conception, or conceptions, regarding the way by which man can reach his higher destiny. Whatever have been the perversions of these conceptions—and they have been gross and many in popular Buddhism—the higher Buddhism has always insisted that it must be by way of obedience to the truth. Man must know the truth, and the truth shall set him free from the bondages of his little self into the liberty of the greater Something.'

ST. COLUMBA.

In June 1916 the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago determined to encourage Irish studies in the universities of America. A society was organized under the name of the 'Irish Foundation of Chicago.' 'The aim of the Foundation is to foster the publication of Irish texts in America by offering academic stipends to train scholars in the Irish language and to enable scholars already trained to devote themselves to the work of editing.' A fellowship 'was established with a stipend of twelve hundred dollars to enable a Research Fellow in Gaelic to give his entire time to the editing of Irish manuscripts. Rev. A. O'Kelleher, of the parish of SS. Peter and Paul Great Crosby, and Lecturer in the University of Liverpool, was offered the appointment in

November 1916. He came to Illinois at once and has since that time devoted himself exclusively to the work of editing. Under the generous auspices of the Graduate School of the University of Illinois it has been possible to publish this *Life of Columcille* after somewhat less than two years of his tenure of the fellowship.' The title of the book is '*Beitha Colaim Chille, Life of Columcille*'. Compiled by Manus O'Donnell in 1532. Edited and translated from manuscript Rawlinson B. 514 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, with introduction, glossary, notes, and indices by A. O'Kelleher, Fellow in Gaelic in the University of Illinois on the Irish Foundation of Chicago, and G. Schoepperle, Associate in English in the University of Illinois' (University of Illinois; \$3.50).

It is a handsome imperial octavo volume with wide margins and clear open printing, the Irish text and English translation being on opposite pages. To say that it is a curious book is to utter the obvious. Here is one of its curious sections. 'On a time that Columcille was in Iona writing, there came to him one of the brethren that had the task of being over the kitchen of the household. And he had a knife in his hand, and he asked Columcille to bless it for him. Then Columcille raised the hand where the pen was, and he turned his back upon his book and blessed the knife. And when the monk had departed, Columcille asked his disciple Diarmaid what was the iron gear that the monk had brought to be blessed by him. Then said Diarmaid that it was a knife for the killing of oxen and sheep.'

"I trust in God," saith Columcille, "that the iron I have blessed will do no hurt to man or beast from this time till judgment."

'And it fell out as Columcille had said, for the monk went straightway to the kitchen, and he laid the knife to the throat of an ox. And it might not redden thereon. And not only that, but of no other beast in the world might blood be drawn with that knife forever. When the monks saw that it was in vain, they bade a smith of the place melt it again, that it might be made anew, and have a good edge. And when the smith had melted it, he said it was iron very hard of kind, and it would be well for the other tools that the monks had for killing oxen and sheep that had need of hardness, to have a portion thereof put in each tool. And thus it was done. But no tool wherein was put aught of that knife hath reddened on man or beast.'

from that time. So God's name and Columcille's were magnified thereby.'

There are many paragraphs quite as curious as that, and some of them are much more edifying. Let us read another. 'Another time after that when Columcille was in the monastery in Iona listening to the service of God, he beheld an angel above the heads of the brethren. And exceeding brightness came into his face when he perceived this, for it might not be that the passing great angelic light that was within his heart should not show itself outwardly in his face when he beheld the angel. And certain of the brethren that were with him in that place asked him what was that great light that had come over his countenance. And he told them that it was an angel he had seen above the brethren. And he said further that wondrous was the subtilty of angels, for he had seen the angel passing through the walls of the monastery outward and inward doing no hurt nor harm neither to himself nor to the walls. And he told them that it was to bless the brethren that the angel had come thither, and to look upon certain treasures of his in the monastery the which he was in point to take away with him. And the brethren understood not what treasure Columcille had said the angel should have, for he construed not his words to them at that time. But the treasure whereof Columcille spake then was his own soul, for he died at the end of six days space right on the eve of Whit-sunday.'

Everything has been done by the editors to make this edition of Manus O'Donnell's *Life of St. Columba* complete and final. At the end of the volume they add a glossary of rarer words, an index of places and tribes, an index of personal names, an index rerum, an index of first lines of quatrains, and a list of chapters in the English translation.

The Secret of Progress is the title which Archdeacon W. Cunningham, F.B.A., F.S.A., has given to his latest volume (Cambridge: at the University Press; 5s. net). What is the secret of progress? It is the consciousness throughout the ages of the hand of God in human affairs. And so Archdeacon Cunningham traces the presence and recognition of God through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and then through the history of the Church from Revelation to the present day. It is a popular volume, and one is not troubled with

questions of authorship or integrity. There in traditional order the narrative stands, and progress of the spiritual consciousness of man be traced. 'The conviction as to the reality of Spiritual Power, which is felt personally, has been confirmed because this belief renders the progress of the human race in the past intelligible. It is also confirmed because it gives insight and guidance for the doing of duties in the present; its truth exemplified in so far as it works. By conscientious endeavours after collective effort, we may be able to give the most effective united witness to Christ.'

A new volume on *The Life of Paul* (Cambridge: at the University Press) will be made welcome. The author, Dr. Benjamin Willard Robins, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary, is a good scholar and a clear writer. He has written briefly, with the Sunday School teacher, perhaps in view, but consecutively and readably enough for any one who wants to spend a quiet hour refreshing his memory with the events of the great apostle's life.

Note one point. On the great problem of the Jerusalem Council and its decrees Professor Robinson has an idea of his own. He believes that St. Luke got indirect information about it which he misunderstood and misplaced, and that in reality no such Council was held or decree issued until long after the date assigned to the in the Acts.

In many ways we begin to realize what the War has cost us. Will it ever inspire new poets to make up for the poets we have lost? Will it bring us new theologians to take the place of men like Lieut. Alec De Candole? He was only twenty-one years of age when he was killed in battle, yet he was able, in a period of convalescence in that same year 1918, to give an account of the faith that was in him in a series of chapters on God, Jesus of Nazareth, the Church, Dogma, Infallibility, Reason and Faith, Miracles, Atonement, Morality, Immortality, and Christianity, all these chapters have been considered by the Deans of Bristol to be well worth publishing. Nor will there a reader of them but will agree. The title of the volume is *The Faith of a Subaltern* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 2s. 6d. net).

Professor Davidson used to say that the best thing he ever wrote was the article on Jeremiah in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. On being asked why it was the best thing, he answered, because he had most affection for Jeremiah and his book of all the men and books of the Bible. The Rev. F. R. Thomson, B.D., has discovered Professor Davidson's article, and (perhaps by means of it) he has discovered Jeremiah and the Book of Jeremiah. His volume on *The Burden of the Lord* (Clarke & Co.; 6s. net) deals with certain aspects of Jeremiah's personality, mission, and age in such a way as a capable and successful teacher and student who had come to appreciate Jeremiah might be expected to do. His book may be taken as an example of the best modern expository discourse. Let us quote three sentences. 'No one had a higher place among the men of whose work the Master could say, "I came not to destroy but to fulfil." How great he was, of whom it can be said that there was that in his work which waited its due recognition and completing until he appeared who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many. Of this greatness we have caught, it is hoped, some glimpses as we have followed the career of our prophet. By receiving a prophet in the name of a prophet we shall have, at least, something of a prophet's reward.'

In his Ingersoll Lecture for 1918 on *Pagan Ideas of Immortality During the Early Roman Empire* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net), Professor C. H. Moore of Harvard brings out one fact which is not often, if ever, clearly recognized by the student of early Christianity. It is the fact that the eschatological ideas of the early Christians—for which we now attempt to apologize—were of immense service in the propagation of Christianity. For similar ideas were widely current in the Mediterranean world and created an atmosphere which made the reception of Christianity easier. The little book is the work of a true scholar and right pleasant to read.

It is the recorded experience of an Encyclopædia editor that there is no topic of human interest but some one has made a special study of it. Cary F. Jacob, M.S., Ph.D., has made *The Foundations and Nature of Verse* his speciality. Under that title he has published a volume at the Columbia University Press. And one's first thought in glancing through

it is that a more uninteresting book for the eye of the average reader could not be written. But get into it and all that is altered. Tone, Pitch, Quality, Intensity, Time, Rhythm, Duration, Accent, all these things become of supreme moment. Your appreciation of poetry seems to depend upon a mere mechanical thing like scansion, and yet, without being able to scan, consciously or unconsciously, you see quite clearly that you can neither write poetry nor understand it. It is an enthusiast's book and he is sufficiently enthusiastic to compel you to share his enthusiasm. No doubt it is written not for the average reader but for the student of literature. It is sane enough and thorough enough to take its place as the best student's manual on the subject.

There are, it seems, four ways of regarding our Lord Jesus Christ. So Mr. Gilbert T. Sadler tells us in his little book *The Gnostic Story of Jesus Christ* (Daniel; 1s. net). There is first of all the view that no such person ever existed. That is Mr. Sadler's own opinion. Next, there is the view that He was a good man and the Messiah. He calls that the 'liberal' view. Thirdly, there is the view of Schweitzer, that He was not necessarily a good man, and certainly not the Messiah, but a dreamer, who promised that He would rise again from the dead and appear in glory as the son of man. Last of all, there is the view that He was the Son of God come in the flesh to be the Saviour of the world. Mr. Sadler admits that that is the view of the New Testament.

The Rev. C. J. Cadoux, D.D., has made a special study of *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, and has published a volume under that title (Headley; 10s. 6d. net). He was not aware probably that at the same time Professor Moffatt was engaged upon the same study. There is no reference in the book to Professor Moffatt's article in the DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, although it is of more value than any of the recent literature to which Mr. Cadoux refers. Perhaps it is well that both men should have worked over the subject independently. Both are thoroughly competent, and it is an extremely interesting exercise to compare the book and the article together. It is enough here and now to say that both authors find the testimony of the early Church too mixed to be of any authoritative value for the present

day. We must still go back to Christ, and according as we understand Christ shall be our attitude to war.

Is there any difference between the ancient and the modern essayist? There is this difference, that for the most part the modern essayist takes his task more seriously. It costs him more. There is Francis Grierson, for example. In order to write the very short essays in *Illusions and Realities of the War* (Lane; 5s. net) he prepared himself by time and travel and money. 'My purpose,' he says, 'at this juncture is to state what I know concerning social and political conditions touching Anglo-American unity. This knowledge has cost me nearly four years of time and a large outlay, having sojourned in all the leading States between New York and Colorado, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. It requires time and patience to learn anything worth knowing.'

And so these essays are worth studying. There is more in them than the superficial reader will find. But every reader will find that their expression is supremely delicate and carefully adapted to the matter to be expressed.

A sketch has been made by B. J. O'Rorke, D.C.O., of the life and work of Lieut.-Colonel H. Storr, D.S.O. The title is *A Soldier and a Man* (Longmans; 3s. net). Colonel Storr went through the Boer War. Then in the days of peace he left the army and became Lay Secretary of the Church of England Men's Society. After two years and three months of strenuous work the European War broke out, and he went out to the front as second in command of the 4th Middlesex Regiment. He was wounded in March 1918 and died in hospital.

It is the record of a silent strong man who gave every ounce of his energy to the cause of Christ.

The Rev. John Pitkin, F.R.G.S., Rector of Teigh, Rutland, and formerly chaplain of various of His Majesty's prisons, had a sensational subject in his hands when he sat down to write on *The Prison Cell in its Lights and Shadows* (Sampson Low; 6s. net), but it must be confessed that he has made a poor affair of it. A story-teller is born, not made, and it is very clear that Mr. Pitkin was not born to tell stories. He has used the Police

News or whatever other spicy periodical details the doings of criminals, but all the colour evaporates in his clumsy hands. It is a disappointing book. Give it to the first boy you meet whose imagination has been perverted by the reading of pen-and-ink dreadfuls and he will soon become disgusted with the whole tawdry business.

We have been rejoicing in the return of both science and philosophy to some serious recognition of religion. We do not know whether Roy Wood Sellars, Ph.D., is a scientist or a philosopher, but certainly there is no sign of repentance in him. He does not believe in miracles. He does not believe in immortality. He does not believe in God. And he does not believe in religion. This is a pretty clean sweep. What does he believe in? He believes in reason and art. It is a curious combination. Perhaps it is meant to be comprehensive. But what is reason? If it is the use of the intellect (and if it is not that, we wish he would tell us what it is), does he imagine that the intellect is not made use of in religion? The title of his book is *The Next Step in Religion* (Macmillan; 8s. net).

The criminologist who is also an idealist is worth listening to, though he may have to be watched. Dr. Maurice Parmelee, whose book on *Criminology* has been published by Messrs. Macmillan (\$2), is thoroughly scientific in both his processes and his products. But he is not content with the enumeration and classification of bare facts; he draws conclusions from his statistics which have a scientific interest and something more. We said he was an idealist. Perhaps we had better say plainly that he is a forward-looking and determined social reformer. He is not the kind of man who botanizes on his mother's grave. He studies the criminal in order that there may be, as soon as possible, no more criminals to study.

Does the last sentence sound Utopian? Dr. Parmelee is not hopelessly an idealist. He cannot bring crime to an end entirely, and he does not think that he can in this world. He will do what he can to bring as much as possible of it to an end. And so he warns us against many of our present ways of treating the criminal. One way is in imprisonment. 'It should,' he says, 'be the aim of every penal administration to diminish as rapidly as possible the use of imprisonment as a form of

punishment. It will never be possible to abolish imprisonment entirely, because there will always remain a residuum of criminals who are so dangerous to society that it is necessary to incarcerate them for the protection of society. But substitutes should be devised as rapidly as possible for most of the forms of imprisonment. Corporal punishment he would abolish at once, 'except possibly for a few young offenders for whom it should be prescribed by competent scientific authorities.'

The Rev. James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary of Pennsylvania, asks the question: *The Coming of the Lord: Will it be Premillennial?* and answers his own question in a book with that title (Macmillan; \$1.75).

'There is general agreement among Christian believers,' he says, 'in accepting the fact of Christ's coming, though there is diversity of view as to its time and mode. Some interpreters take all these declarations in the literal sense that Christ will come in bodily form in the clouds in glory with the angels so that all the people on the earth shall see him with their eyes; and others take the same language in a figurative and spiritual sense, very much as we now interpret in a spiritual sense the equally materialistic descriptions of Christ's first coming in the Old Testament. But the point now before us is that practically all students of and believers in the Bible accept the fact of Christ's return in some sense to this world in glory. This is "that blessed hope" which has been cherished through all the Christian centuries and which gives final value to the reign of Christ and kingdom of God. Amidst all our differences we are to hold on to this central fact and follow this hope as a star that leads us on and lifts us up during our earthly pilgrimage and service.'

At this point, however, he continues, 'there emerges the divergence known as the postmillennial and the premillennial views. Both of these theories hold that there is to be a period of prevailing righteousness and reign of Christ in the world, commonly known as the millennium. This word is not found in the Bible, but is from the Latin word for a thousand years, the period in the vision in Rev 20¹⁻⁷ during which the souls of martyrs and confessors reign with Christ. The terms "premillennial" and "postmillennial" are

unfortunate and misleading as they depend upon the word "millennium," which refers to a highly figurative passage and greatly disputed subject; but they have become so established in usage that they cannot well be dispensed with or replaced by others. The vital point of difference between the two theories is that postmillenarianism holds that the world will be converted to Christianity before Christ comes in his final advent, and premillenarianism reverses this order and holds that Christ must come before the world is converted.'

Professor Snowden is a postmillennialist. In his volume he gives his reasons. He gives them temperately and at length. The book is sure to find many readers in such a time as this.

There is a form of literature which is much enjoyed by the initiate. It is not the old essay or the new short story. Nor can it be called a co-operation between these two, though it partakes of both—its admirers say of the best of both. In any case it is a thing by itself, and Mr. H. M. Tomlinson is one of its most accepted exponents.

It is literature, we said, for the initiate. *Old Junk* (Melrose; 4s. 6d. net) is disappointing at the outset. But proceed. You began with the idea that you were to enjoy a short story with adventure in it. Travel there is, but no adventure worth speaking about, and no story at all. All that seems so is mere dramatic setting for the description of character, say rather for the psychological analysis of character, which makes the book. After a little its interest becomes quite absorbing, and when you lay down the book you feel that you have had a good time.

One of the most vivid descriptions of Jewish life that we have ever read is contained in *The Shadow of the Cross* (Melrose; 5s. net). It is also one of the most intimate studies. The book was written by Paul and Jean Tharaud. It has been translated by Frances Delanoy Little. It is an amazing narrative. If it were not so minutely and manifestly true to life it would be incredible. It is the story of a Hungarian village and the Jews who live in it. It resolves itself at last into the story of one little boy whose lot it was, in the inscrutable providence of God, to be born in that village and of Jewish parents, parents to whom love was nothing and the Law everything. They thought themselves the special favourites of the God of Glory

and their life the only religious life upon earth. It is surely the most irreligious form of religion ever believed in by man.

The Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A., is one of the most accomplished but least dogmatic of our present-day writers in theology. He is a student of the Bible, and out of that treasury he brings forth things new in surprising abundance and surprising felicity. His little book, *Not Dead, but Living* (Morgan & Scott ; 6d.), is 'for thoughts.'

The name of John W. Stevenson may never be as famous as the name of Hudson Taylor. But as a force in the China Inland Mission he was a good second, and in faith, if not in works, sometimes first. Surely he deserved this little biography by Marshall Broomhall, M.A. It is small enough beside the two mighty volumes of Hudson Taylor's biography. Its title is *John W. Stevenson: One of Christ's Stalwarts* (Morgan & Scott ; 2s. 6d. net).

The late Dr. Paul Carus edited and translated Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, and had his work published in an extremely attractive little volume under the title of *Virgil's Prophecy on the Saviour's Birth* (Open Court Publishing Co. ; 2s. net).

What is a Dogma? will not be an attractive title to everybody, but everybody will be attracted by the appearance of the little book in which the question is answered. The author is Edouard Le Roy. It is translated into English by Lydia G. Robinson (Open Court ; 2s. net). What is the answer? It is given in two propositions: '(1) The intellectualist conception which is current to-day renders the greater number of objections raised by the idea of dogma unsolvable. (2) On the other hand, a doctrine of primacy of action permits a solution of the problem without abandoning either the rights of thought or the requirements of dogma.'

Mr. Alfred T. Schofield, M.D., M.R.C.S., is one of the most voluminous writers in the medical or any other profession. The reason is partly no doubt that he has the gift, but partly also that he has chosen as his own that borderland which lies between science and religion, and is of all tracts of territory the most interesting to the

greatest number. His latest book is on *Nerves in Disorder* (Pickering & Inglis ; 2s. 6d. net). It is more purely scientific than usual, but it is addressed to the same class as before. Should neurasthenics read it? Surely, if they will follow its advice.

Mr. Alfred Forder is one of our best equipped Palestinian scholars. We think he has written more serious and more scientific books than *In and About Palestine* (R.T.S. ; 3s. 6d. net), but not one that is more delightfully illustrated or more agreeable to read. Read carefully, however. You will find that every pleasant chapter has something scientific in it—a new discovery perhaps, or the confirmation of a doubtful site.

The great idea in education now is to offer the child nothing but what it can understand. Well, the Rev. Charles Brown, D.D., offers it Bunyan's *Holy War*. Will it understand that? It will not understand a word of it. What sense is there, then, in delivering addresses to children on Bunyan's *Holy War*? There is plenty of sense in it. We know a parent who read the *Holy War* to his five-year-old. The one enjoyed the war, the other the allegory. But the five-year-old remembered the story and he knows and understands the allegory now. Dr. Brown calls his addresses *The Oldest City in the World* (R.T.S. ; 3s. net).

Lieut. the Rev. Edward Vernon, M.A., has published a volume of children's sermons under the title of *Through* (Scott ; 3s. net). 'Through' is the title of one of the sermons, and it does not give a good idea of the book. For all the sermons, including the one on 'Through,' are bound together by a single striking idea. It is the idea of signalling. There is variety enough in the duties of the signalman to furnish the text for nine delightful addresses.

Two lectures by I. Wassilevsky, Phil.B., F.S.P., the one on *Hebrew Poetry of To-day*, the other on *Ezekiel*, have been published by Messrs. Sherratt and Hughes of Manchester, with a preface by Professor C. H. Herford (2s. net).

When the soldier is invited to accept Christ he sometimes asks for reasons why. And the chaplain has not always the reason ready to hand. Henceforth let all chaplains and others who have to do

with men who ask the reason why possess a copy of the Rev. F. W. Butler's book entitled *The Grounds of Christian Belief* (Skeffington; 3s. net). They will have no more hesitation. It is a book of distinct ability, and of clear insight into the problems with which we are now so urgently exercised.

The Rev. Thomas Allen Tidball, D.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of the South, Sewanee, has long been in the habit of delivering lectures on *The Making of the Church of England*. These lectures have now been issued by the Stratford Company of Boston (\$2). They are addressed not to special students of ecclesiastical history but to the average churchman and churchwoman, and they are written in clear simple nervous English. Professor Tidball is a loyal son of the Anglican Church and brings out very clearly its original independence of Rome. But no one can honestly accuse him of prejudice or passion.

Mr. A. Osborne Eaves is a follower of that form of religion which is known by the name of New

Thought. He is the author of many books. One of them entitled *Your Powers, and How to Use Them* has been revised and issued in a second edition (Harrogate: Talisman Publishing Co.).

Every man who has formed a library considers himself able to tell others how a library should be formed. But now at last we have come upon a man who can do it. Mr. Reginald R. Buckley tells us *How and What to Read* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net) in a volume of most unattractive outward appearance, but of quite extraordinary interest and effectiveness within. First of all, he makes no mistakes. As Professor Moffatt writes his name with two 't's he does not cut one off, and he allows Dr. Denney the use of his second e. Not one single misspelling have we detected after a considerable and careful search. Next, he is a lover of books. He speaks about them not as if they were dry goods or blocks of timber, but as if they had life and a capacity for friendship. But best of all, his acquaintance with every department of human knowledge is intimate and his discernment unerring.

The Possibility of Temptation in the Life of our Lord.

BY THE REV. H. J. WICKS, B.A., D.D., LOUGHTON.

In what way could such an one as Jesus Christ be really exposed to the force of temptation? This is an old question, and one which inevitably arises in the mind of every thoughtful reader of the Gospels. It is a question to which every preacher needs to give careful attention that he may answer it wisely, that he may help men and women to realize the actuality of the Lord's temptations. Every one realizes the difficulty. We are tempted because there is that in us which has some affinity with the evil, because at some points there is defect of goodness in us which makes us vulnerable when we are assailed. But we all understand the thought of the schoolboy to whom his master said, 'Why are you not a good child like William Channing?' 'Oh,' he said, 'it is easy for William Channing to be good.' The lad was not wrong. It is easier for some to be good than it is for others. One

man in circumstances might be sorely tempted to lie, and if he should resist we would applaud him as a hero. A second man in the same case would have no battle at all to fight. An inward, intense scorn of falsehood would make him immune. The evil thing would make no appeal to his nature. For the loftier a man is in character the less accessible he is to the seductions of the evil one; and so, how could any temptation really assail Jesus? We must certainly affirm that a temptation to some line of conduct nakedly and plainly wicked could not have had any power at all with Him for a moment. He was too pure for that, too high-souled. The temptation which could be a real peril to Him must have derived all its force against Him from the limitations inherent in His manhood. Mr. B. H. Strachan is surely right when he says: 'The expressions "guise of sinful

flesh" and "in human guise," adopted by Moffatt in his translations of Romans viii. 3 and Phil. ii. 8, fall below the extraordinary standard of successful rendering elsewhere. The pre-existent Son of God did not "masquerade" in the flesh. No, He had renounced His high estate for the time being. He had become poor for our sakes. He had become a man with a man's limitations, though endowed in a unique degree with the Holy Spirit, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is clearly justified when he represents Jesus as a man exercising faith in God. Consequently, the temptation to doubt *could* come to Him. In the story of the Temptation as given in St. Matthew and St. Luke, we read that the Devil challenged Him with that word: 'If thou be the Son of God,' and that He answered, 'Thou shalt not test the Lord thy God.' It is plain that He was thinking of the Israelites in the Wilderness who wished to test God in captious, unreasonable, and unbelieving mood. And, reading these words of our Lord, we realize that there came to Him as to us the temptation to doubt God which we know must have been an intense agony to Him, as indeed it is to us. We see Him flinging off the thought. We see Him—our Brother, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh—lifting His face heavenward, resolved that He *will* trust the heavenly Father. That plainly was a temptation which could come powerfully even to Jesus, the ideal man. Was it not indeed inevitable to Him who had 'emptied Himself'?

Again, the Lord in those days in the wilderness was doubtless confronting the work which lay before Him. When later in His career He heard the appeal of the Syrophenician woman, He was silent at first, and when He spoke to her He uttered words which might have extinguished all hope in her heart. His attitude in that case is a well-known *crux interpretum*; but is not the explanation this, that He was thinking the matter out? St. Mark tells us that He wanted privacy (7²⁴). It was vital to the future of His work in the world that He should have the opportunity to instruct the men who were to be His apostles. He would lose that opportunity if His fame as a healer should spread in Tyre and Sidon. Moreover, He was conscious that by the will of God His ministry was to be limited to Israel during His earthly life. He does not say her nay, because the great tenderness in His heart makes Him eager to say yes. But then, ought He to do it? Is it the will of

God? When Hananiah startled Jeremiah by a confident prophecy, Jeremiah was silent and went his way. For the moment he was not sure what the will of God was. But soon the word of the Lord came to him, and then he sent Hananiah a decided reply in the name of God. And I think it was thus with the Master on this occasion. He was silent to that woman because He was waiting to know the Father's will. He was usually swift in decision, but on this occasion the hour was not yet come to act. He was meditating, uncertain for the moment what He ought to do. And must we not think that in the wilderness He passed through a closely similar experience? He knew well that His whole conception of God and of religion must bring Him into collision with the leading religious men of His day. He knew that he would have to encounter their most bitter and deadly opposition. He saw clearly what would be the issue of that ministry to which God was summoning Him. And, as it would seem, He was tormented by questionings at the outset. Was that really the road which it was God's will for Him to take? Might it not be that He should take some other path, not only a less thorny road, but also one that would more surely lead to His goal? For we must keep it steadily in mind that He was real man. He knew what it was to shrink even as we do. He had to set His face like a flint to go to Jerusalem. His friends saw the iron resolution on His countenance, and they were amazed and afraid. He was the very personification of courage, as He has been its inspiration in countless men. On the very eve of the Cross He could speak of His joy and His peace. But that did not mean that He was always on such a serene height that He could contemplate the future without any hesitation or misgiving. Though He often spoke of the Cross as inevitable, His prayer in the garden conclusively proves that He had moments in which He hoped that He might escape from it. Otherwise His words would be meaningless. 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.'

Is it not this temptation to which reference is made when it is reported that the enemy suggested to Him the idea of offering homage to himself? That, taken literally, would be no temptation to *us*, far less to Jesus Christ. It could only excite horror in our minds. But we are tempted to sin in a variety of ways, and every sin is a virtual enthronement of Satan instead of God in our lives. It

would seem therefore that our Lord was tempted in the wilderness to pursue some line of conduct which He, upon reflection, saw would be a departure from God's plan for Him and which consequently would be a surrender to the evil one, not a literal bending of the knee to Satan but *that* in effect. The tempter's most subtle and powerful appeal to us is never to sin. His method is to persuade us to do something which seems quite lawful, permissible, and innocent. Yielding to the wrong thing we do not call it sin at the moment,

however gravely we may blame ourselves afterwards. Rather, the tempter comes as an angel of light, deceiving the unwary soul. And our Lord's experience is not unlike our own. Evil came to Him disguised, presenting itself to Him as something perhaps good, and although He had no affinity with sin in His perfectly holy nature, the temptation had power: it was dangerous to Him by reason of those human limitations which He had accepted in order to become our example and our Saviour.

Babylon and 'The Land beyond the River.'

BY S. LANGDON, M.A., READER IN ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

THE Euphrates by reason of its natural importance and geographical significance was known to Babylonians, Assyrians, Hebrews, and Aramæans as 'The River.' From the point of view of an Assyrian writer, Syria and the western provinces along the Mediterranean coast were termed the *mat e-bir nāri*, or 'Land beyond the river.' Although Asarhaddon in his treaty with Bālu of Tyre speaks of the gods of various western cities as *ilāni e-bir nāri*, 'gods beyond the river,'¹ we do not meet with the definite geographical term *mat e-bir nāri*, 'Land beyond the river,' for Syria and Palestine until the reign of Asurbanipal. The former king ruled over Assyria and Babylonia, 680-668; his son Asurbanipal ruled from 668 to 626. It is probable that in his reign the Assyrians officially adopted this term to describe later Greek Coile Syria. At any rate the definite term *mat e-bir nāri*, 'Land beyond the river,' occurs first in Assyrian letters which almost certainly belong to this reign.² In Babylonia this geographical expression does not occur before the Persian period, and is there employed for one of the satrapies or provinces of the Persian Empire, in which Damascus was probably regarded as the principal city. We know from Ezra and Nehemiah, who employed

this Babylonian expression as a name of the western province, that it included Samaria and Jerusalem. According to the divisions imposed by Darius the Great it constituted the fifth satrapy of Herodotus' list,³ or the countries from Cilicia to Egypt.

The term first occurs in this sense in a contract dated in the third year of Cyrus (535 B.C.), and concerns money which one Babylonian loaned to another in *Ebir-nāri*.⁴ Although the satrapy of the 'Land beyond the river' or *Eber-hannahar*, as the Hebrews termed it, or *Abar-naharā* in its Aramaic form, constituted a single satrapy in the final orders of Darius, this was certainly not the original political arrangement under Cyrus, Cambyses, and in the early years of the reign of Darius. A contract dated in the first year of Darius (521 B.C.) names one *Ushtanu* as satrap of Babylon and *Ebir-nāri*.⁵ Another contract dated in the third year of Darius has *Ushtannu*,⁶ governor of Babylon and *Ebir-nāri*.

But we know from contemporary records that Gobryas the famous Persian prince of the land Pateischoris, and the leader of the army of Cyrus

¹ Herodotus, iii. 91.

² Strassmaier, *Inscriptions von Cyrus*, 144.

³ Strassmaier, *Inscriptions von Darius*, 27. 3. This is the source of Winckler's erroneous statement in *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3rd edition, p. 188, where he says that *Uštani* was the first satrap of Babylon and *Ebir-nāri*. *Uštani* is 'Tšrāvṣ, father of Badres, in Herodotus, vii. 77.

⁴ Text *Uš-ta-an-ni* in the genitive.

¹ K. 3500 in Hugo Winckler's *Altorientalische Forschungen*, ii. 10-15; see line 9. Note also the phrase *šarrāni e-bir nāri*, 'the kings beyond the river,' in an inscription of Asurbanipal (Streck, *Asurbanipal*, vol. ii. 160. 25).

² Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, No. 67, Rev. 5 and No. 706, Rev. 3.

which captured Babylon, became the first governor of Babylon. He had already been made governor of Assyria by Cyrus before the fall of Babylon.¹ According to a letter recently published by Scheil in the *Revue d'Assyriologie* xi., 166, Gubarru or Gobryas was an officer in the service of Nebuchadnezzar. Scheil on the basis of this discovery believes that Xenophon's account of Gobryas in the *Cyropedæa* is the true one. Xenophon reports Gobryas to have been an Assyrian (*i.e.* Babylonian) by origin and already an old man when he aided Cyrus in the conquest of Babylon. Xenophon's account has been generally discredited, and certainly Scheil has done much to reinstate his authority. But we shall see that Gobryas, who married a sister of Darius the Great, became governor of Babylon and the land Ebir-nâri in 538, and retained this position under Cambyses. He appears among the great Persian generals of Darius in the Behistun Inscription, § 68, *Gaubaruwa* in the Persian text, *Gubaru* in the Babylonian. In the fourth and fifth years of the reign of Darius he was sent in charge of an army against Elam,² that is, in 518-17 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar died in 562. Assuming Gobryas to have been in his service in 565, he was still on active military service 48 years later. When Xenophon states that he was an old man already at the conquest of Babylon in 538, the statement is to be taken with reserve. Were he 50 years old in 538, he was 71 when he led the army of Darius against Elam. It is impossible to determine when Gobryas was relieved of his duties as satrap of Babylon and the Ebir-nâri, but we may assume perhaps that Cambyses required his services as general in his armies in the invasion of Egypt (525 B.C.), or perhaps he was removed from his satrapy by Darius in his first year during the confusion caused by the revolt of Smerdis. At any rate a contract dated in the fourth year of Cambyses (529-522) mentions Gubarru or Gobryas as governor of Babylon simply.³

But another contract dated apparently in the accessional year of Darius (522) mentions Gobryas as governor of Babylon and Ebir-nâri.⁴ The name

of the king is here almost entirely obliterated, but the traces favour the reading Darius rather than Cambyses. Since we know Ushtanu to have been satrap of the same provinces in the first regnal year of Darius, it seems evident that (granting the correctness of my emendation of the contract, *Dar.* 9) the first satrap of Babylon and Trans-euphrates, namely, Gobryas, was relieved of his duties in the first year of Darius. The controller of the granaries of Gubarru is mentioned in the first year of Cambyses (529 B.C.).⁵

The above outline of the career of the famous Gobryas is confirmed by a remarkable tablet now in the collection of the Rev. J. B. Nies of Brooklyn, New York. It has been published by Dr. C. E. Keiser in his *Letters and Contracts from Erech Written in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, Yale University Press, 1917. The tablet to which I refer is No. 169 of his volume, and reads as follows:—

1. *Shamešidri*, the governor of Larsa,
2. *Hushi-ili*, a king's chief servant,⁶ who was in charge of the treasury,
3. *Arad-Marduk*, son of *Zeria*, son of *Egibi*,
4. *Marduk-shum-ušur*, son of *Bel-uballit*, son of *Bûšu*,
5. *Nabu-bêlshunu*, son of *Nadinu*, son of *Ab'ûtu*,
6. *Nabu-bêlshunu*, son of *Bêl-ab-ushubshi*, son of *Amel-Ea*,
7. *Mushezib-Bêl*, son of *Balatsu*, son of *Amel-Ea*,
8. *Ishtar-zêr-ibni*, son of *Bêl-iķbi*, son of *Hanab*,
9. are the freemen in whose presence *Nabu-mukîn-apli*, the keeper of *Eanna*,⁷
10. son of *Nadini*, son of *Dabibi* and *Nabu-ah-iddin*,
11. a king's chief servant, an overseer of *Eanna*, to *Shamash-ab-iddin*, son of
12. *Shamash-shum-iddin*, son of *Karrad-Anu* and to *Ea-kurbanni*,
13. son of *Nabu-etîr-napshati*, son of *Ea-kurbanni*,
14. an inspector of Erech, said
15. as follows: 'When you keep the guard of *Eanna*
16. let the libation bearers constantly

¹ See Prašek, *Geschichte der Meder und Perser*, 227.

² Darius, *Behistun*, § 71.

³ Pinches, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1916, 29.

⁴ Strassmaier, *Darius*, No. 9. Restore the text of line 16 as follows: *ina ki-i-bil ša Gu-[bar-ru amel piḥat] Bâbili ù Ebir-nâri*.

⁵ *Amelu rab kâri ša Gu-ba-ru* (Strassmaier, *Cambyses*, 96. 3, 4, 8).

⁶ *rēš-šarri* occurs also in Clay, *Babylonian Expedition*, viii. 42. 2f., where he is preceded by the *zâ-za-a-ku* = *zazakkû*, executor of the offerings, see *A.J.S.L.* 30, 228; *Hommel Festschrift*, 155; cf. Strassmaier, *Nbk.* 134. 19, etc.

⁷ Temple of Ishtar in Erech.

17. keep the guard with you.'¹
18. Shamash-ab-iddin and Ea-kurbanni said
19. as follows: 'The guard of Eanna we will not keep,
20. and the libation bearers we will not summon.
21. If the libation bearers for the guard of the inner city
22. be summoned a transgression against Gobryas² satrap of Babylon
23. and the Land beyond the river they will commit.'
24. The scribe is Shiriktum - Azagsud, son of Balaṭu.
25. At Erech, month Kislev, 17th day, year of the accession of
26. Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of the lands.

The contents of this document refer to some unknown political disturbance in Erech on the death of Cyrus and the succession of Cambyses. It is, in fact, a state document and of much more human interest than an ordinary contract. The chief importance for us, however, consists in the title of Gobryas and the date. It confirms what had already been assumed by Winckler. When the empire of Babylonia was conquered by the Persians it formed at first a single satrapy, and Gobryas was the first governor under Cyrus and Cambyses. The second governor was Ushtanu, appointed in the first year of Darius Hystaspis.

These considerations concern Biblical criticism, and incidentally South Arabian studies, vitally.

¹ According to Keiser, No. 2, keeping the guard of the temple consisted in furnishing clean offerings.

² *Gu-bar-ru.*

For, as we have seen, it is improbable that the inhabitants of Western Asia, the Hebrews, Aramaeans, and Mineans adopted the geographical term 'Land beyond the river' for Syria before its inclusion in the Persian Empire as a satrapy. They surely would not have described themselves as the *Ebir-hannahar* with reference to the Euphrates; the term was imposed on them and their lands by the Persian Empire. Therefore those Hebrew texts in which *Eber-hannahar* occurs for Syria are obviously later than 538 B.C. or the first year of Cyrus as 'king of Babylon and the lands.' This fact has long been recognized in Biblical criticism and has a bearing upon only one passage whose date is not otherwise obviously post-Exilic, that is, I K 5⁴, where Solomon is said to have reigned in all *Eber-hannahar*, from Thapsacus on the Euphrates to Gaza. Naturally this statement could have been composed in the Persian period only.

The Minean inscription discovered by Halevy (535), and later by Glaser in Yemen, and published by Hugo Winckler in his *Muṣri, Meluhha, and Ma'īn*,⁵ contains the remarkable phrase, 'They who journeyed to Egypt and traded . . . in Egypt, Assyria and *Abar-naharān*.' This word undoubtedly means Syria here, and is due to Persian influence which had penetrated into the remote lands of Southern Arabia. That is extremely important in view of the efforts recently made by Arabists to date this particular inscription several centuries before Cyrus.

³ *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1898. See the valuable criticism and restoration of this text by Hartmann in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xi. 79, and Ed. Meyer, *ibid.* 327.

In the Study.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Third Sunday after Trinity.

APPRECIATION.

⁴ 'Unto you therefore which believe he is precious.'—
I P 2⁷.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE has an essay entitled 'Who owns the Mountains?' 'What is property, after all?' he asks. 'The law says there are two kinds, real and personal. But it seems to me that

the only real property is that which is truly personal, that which we take into our inner life and make our own forever, by understanding and admiration and sympathy and love. . . . We measure success by accumulation. The measure is false. The true measure is appreciation. He who loves most has most.'

And here in St. Peter's words we come against the most important illustration of that general principle. 'The true measure is appreciation,' and

he who has learned to appreciate Christ at His true worth is rich beyond the dreams of avarice. 'For you which believe is the preciousness.' Faith might be defined as the faculty of spiritual appreciation; or if we look at it from the upper rather than the under side, we might call it a grace rather than a faculty, for it is the gift of God. But be it faculty from within or gift from above, there are ways open to us of developing and intensifying its power.

1. This power of appreciation, like that which we use in ordinary life, is partly based on knowledge and grows with knowledge. It is a commonplace of human experience that the great masterpieces are appreciated only gradually, and come into their kingdom as men begin to understand them. It has taken some works of musical genius a generation or two to establish their prestige. They were played at first to the few; the many had not ears to hear. Now with growing knowledge the many follow where the few first led. If a man does not enjoy a lecture by an expert, or a picture-gallery filled with the great masters, the reason, or a part of it, may be that he does not know enough to enjoy. The same thing applies to our appreciation of Christ. The first disciples grew in appreciation as they grew in knowledge. The beginning of discipleship was the beginning of that appreciation; and as intimacy grew, they discerned more and more fully the preciousness which was unfolding itself before them, until Peter, even amid his failures, could assert his love, until John could say, 'We know him that is true,' until they all in their measure discovered, with Paul, 'the unsearchable riches of Christ'—Christ the poor man's infinite portion, Christ the El Dorado of the soul in quest of spiritual reality.

Some modern believers feel themselves deficient in the power of spiritual appreciation because they cannot join sincerely in some of the great historic hymns of catholic faith and love. The raptures are too strong for them. The words are more passionate than they would employ. In such matters, there will always be difference of taste and temperament. But it is conceivable that some souls, if they only knew Christ better, if they deliberately made themselves students in His school, might love Him more,—and more consciously. It takes knowledge to appreciate the Portrait that is altogether lovely, to appreciate the Name that is a song.¹

2. This power of appreciation is also based upon hunger and thirst. Again, one may draw

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 96.

the analogy from the ordinary affairs of life, for appetite is always appreciation. 'The full soul loatheth an honeycomb; but to the hungry every bitter thing is sweet' (Pr 27). There is a mental parallel: we appreciate a book which meets our need—our need of guidance, or of instruction, or of comfort; and its well-thumbed pages bear the marks of our appreciation, though a neighbour who did not feel the same need might have it upon his shelves, with the dust of neglect lying thick upon it. These things are parables of a spiritual reality to which St. Peter's words bring us near. Among those who early learned to appreciate Jesus, some of the most eager were those contemptuously branded 'publicans and sinners,' and what key had they to unlock this treasury except their sense of need? They—and many others like them since those golden days of the marvellous ministry—were among the hungry whom He filled with good things while He sent the rich empty away. And the paradox of Proverbs has its counterpart in the spiritual realm—to the hungry even the bitter things in Christ are sweet. A sense of need interprets the Cross which all the wisdom of the world cannot understand: it yields to the majestic and inexorable claim against which the proud will still rebels: it submits to the rod of His discipline, and where others might find only a taskmaster, it says, 'Thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.' So hunger is Christ's interpreter, and poverty is His strange evangelist to draw His own to Himself.

3. And appreciation, here as in other realms, is also based on sympathy. When a Walter Pater writes an appreciation of a William Wordsworth, the very act is a confession of a certain sympathy between the two minds. And two souls are often drawn together and learn to appreciate each other because they both have embarked upon a common aim.

Two clear souls

That see a truth, and turning, see at once
Each the other's face glow in that truth's delight,
Are drawn like lovers.

Did not our Lord put that from His own side when He said, 'Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice'? They were servants of truth and He was King of truth, and therefore they and He drew together amid the whirling confusions of the world, and understood one another whosoever

ight misunderstand. It is a dangerous thing to allow ourselves to get out of sympathy with our Master, and to that risk we are continually tempted in this world that crucified Him—out of sympathy with His love, His purity, His humble and lowly heart. We must pray for sensitive consciences and loyal wills, that this sympathy between Him and us may not be broken, but that living near Him we may discover how much is in Him of the very fulness of truth and grace. A loyal conscience may discern wonders which mere skill of intellect may altogether miss. That is why the simple and the humble are often wiser than some who would be counted their teachers. They are in the fellowship. They have found their satisfaction. It is real. It is sufficient. It is abiding—a preciousness which life does not exhaust, which still comforts and contents the soul when death loosens the grasp upon all other possessions.¹

Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE.

'I know.'—I Ti 1¹².

It is a common thing to hear it affirmed with much emphasis that Christian religion is a matter of faith, not of knowledge; for knowledge, we are told, belongs to the world of matter and of sense, and is based upon observation, whereas faith transcends all such limitations, and moves in a region where knowledge can offer her no resistance. Knowledge is of the mind, and is to be pursued by the careful and industrious exercise of our intellectual faculties, while faith is of the imagination, of the emotions, of the affections, of our moral sensibilities and perhaps to some extent even of the will. In fact, it has to do with all that is covered by that familiar word 'the heart.' Tennyson has given voice to this sentiment in words that are familiar to us all:

We have but faith: we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see.

We are apt to accept this sentiment as though it could not be challenged, one of those many obvious truths which float about in an undefined way in the brain, until some man of genius expresses them for us, and then we accept them as self-evident, and value them none the less because

they seem to be just the very thought that we have always been thinking.

But is it really true? Are we then really all alike agnostics; some of us, devout agnostics who believe although we do not know, and some of us consistent agnostics who refuse to believe what we cannot know? St. Paul, at least, belongs to neither of these classes; he affirms, indeed, that he believes, but he also asseverates that he knows the object on whom his faith rests, and he represents himself as believing because he did know.

Surely it would be truer to say that faith rests on knowledge, although it is not limited by it; and that Christian religion is a matter of faith resting on a foundation of knowledge. Indeed, unless we affirm this, it is difficult to see what there is to protect us against the wildest excesses of religious fanaticism. Faith becomes credulity and religion superstition the moment that we lose sight of the connexion between knowing and believing.

In that grand utterance of our text, St. Paul takes his stand against that intellectual agnosticism which asserts our ignorance of all that lies outside the range of sense experience, in fact of all that professes to be spiritual; while at the same time he is equally at issue with moral unbelief, that refusal of the heart to rest in what the mind accepts, which renders nugatory the professed faith of so many that bear the Christian name.

His knowledge was both direct and indirect: for in his vision of Christ there was an element of knowledge that does not usually fall to the lot of believers in the Christian revelation. Let us consider what he knew.

1. To begin with, he could recall as a matter of personal knowledge due to consciousness the violent prejudice and intense antipathy with which he had once regarded the faith that he subsequently preached, and he could estimate the moral effects that had been induced in him by this particular form of religious enthusiasm; how it narrowed his sympathies and hardened his heart, how it killed brotherly love and generated the fiercest hatred. When people talk, as they do, about the elevating influence of religious enthusiasm, they would do well to reflect upon this object-lesson; and compare Saul the persecutor, with his enthusiasm of hatred, with Paul the Apostle, with his enthusiasm of self-sacrificing love.

2. Then again he knew that the change had been wrought, and he knew how it had been

¹ J. M. E. Ross, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 98.

wrought. It was a matter of knowledge with him that a light brighter than the noon-day sun had shone upon him and his fellow-travellers, and that a voice inarticulate, but apparently not inaudible to them, had fallen on his ears charging him with the sin of persecuting his Lord. He knew full well the keen distress, the profound conviction of sin that had weighed him down during those dark days that he had spent in the street called Straight ; he knew how he had wrestled with God for pardon in an agony of prayer ; and he knew how at last the answer came and the terrible anguish gave place to a heavenly peace, as he arose and was baptized, and washed away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.

3. Not less did he know the moral change that this strange experience had introduced. He found himself indeed a new creature in Christ Jesus, with new views of the character of God and a new sense of close and filial relationship to Him ; with a new consciousness of spiritual power working within his own soul and a burning zeal glowing in his heart and inspiring his conduct. The joy, the peace, the love, the power, the triumphant philanthropy, the tender sympathy, the fearless courage, the persevering patience,—all these were facts in his experience, and therefore matters of direct knowledge, and he knew to what they were attributable. But this was not all : his direct knowledge of these inward facts was confirmed by that indirect knowledge which came from the inferences that his work was continuously suggesting. He himself tells us that he was not ashamed of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, because he found it to be 'the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' He found in his wide experience that even without the supernatural manifestations, by which he had himself been affected, others who received his report shared in the moral and spiritual benefits of which he was himself conscious. He proved in his own ministry its wondrous capacity of transforming licentious and degraded heathen into happy, consecrated Christians, adorning the doctrine that they professed by lives that witnessed to the presence of a divine power.

4. And through a long career of many trials and much hardship, he knew that he had lived his life in continuous reliance on this most mysterious Being ; he tells us this much, and he knew that his confidence had not been disappointed. Again and again he had proved the truth of the assurance,

'My grace is sufficient for thee,' in many a stormy hour, in many a shock of battle against spiritual foes and adverse human influences, he had put this assurance to the test, and had never found it fail. Hence there was an abundant basis of knowledge for a faith that rose above knowledge ; he knew enough to warrant him in trusting more, and now standing on the border land of the great unknown he asserts his fearless confidence not only for the present, but also for a future with which as yet knowledge can have nothing to do.¹

Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

GUARDING THE FAITH.

'I have kept the faith.'—2 Ti 4⁷.

Paul speaks of the faith as a trust committed to his care. It had been given him by revelation from God, and to it he had devoted his whole life. He had kept it from the covert attacks of mistaken Christians and the open assaults of unbelief. He had kept it through those hours of spiritual darkness through which he, no less than others, had had to pass. He had kept it in Jerusalem before the mob howling for his denial of it ; before philosophers who sneered at its absurdity ; before Roman power, with its burning pitch, and bloody arena, and executioner's block.

In the arena and on the *stadium* every thing was duly ordered and prescribed, nothing left to chance or choice, and he that strove for the mastery was not crowned except he strove lawfully. In the race, there must be no deviation from the line marked out for the runner ; in the combat, no unfairness nor violation of the rules. 'I therefore so run not as uncertainly,' saith the apostle ; 'so fight I, not as one that beateth the air ; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest after having preached to others I myself should be rejected.' 'Would you obtain a prize in the Olympic games?' said the pagan philosopher. 'A noble design ! But consider the requirements and the consequences. You must live by rule ; you must eat when you are not hungry ; you must abstain from agreeable food ; you must habituate yourself to suffer cold and heat ; in one word you must surrender yourself in all things to the guidance of a physician.' 'The just shall live by his faith.' Without adherence to this rule, there is no reward. 'The life which I live in the flesh,' saith St. Paul, 'I live by the faith of the Son of God.' It is faith that strengthens the Christian *agonisti* with might in the inner man. It is faith that unites the soul to Christ, and overcomes the world. The shipwreck of faith is the shipwreck also of a good conscience. Keep

¹ W. H. M. H. Aitken, in *The Cambridge Review*.

the faith, and it will keep you. St. Paul kept it, and triumphed in martyrdom.¹

1. It is not easy to keep the faith. For the chief object of all evil is to take our faith away. Not merely are the arguments of professed infidelity directed to this end. To this end are directed also the far subtler arguments of the practical world with which we must mingle. The pressure of constant work tends to rob us of our faith, because it suggests that what we gain comes only from our own skill and toil. The ways of the world, in its social relations, too often suggest that it is folly to live for distant pleasures and rewards when tangible ones can be had immediately. Then, in the association of trial and sorrow, we feel a giant's hand striving to wrest from us our faith in the goodness and being of God. We find the struggle of struggles to maintain our faith in God when His ways are strange; our faith in man when the soul is hidden in fleshliness and sin; our faith in immortality; and, as the centre of all truth, our faith in Jesus Christ. And even as we rally our resolution there sometimes comes the sickening doubt whether we are right in maintaining the contest.

2. How do we know that we *have* the faith. We know it by the fruits which 'the faith' has always borne; so that no lives are so God-like as those of believers. We know by the clear historic testimony which has been borne to the truth of Jesus; by the effects which faith in Him have produced in the life of humanity. We know it by the testimony of our own souls to their spiritual and God-like nature.

Wherever this faith is, there will be much besides: there will be a certain sweetness of temper; there will be serenity in life's trials; there will be patience in difficulties and courage in sorrows; there will be a constant endeavour after righteousness; there will be a deep sense of brotherhood, large human interests, and a wealth of human love; there will be hope for humanity, and a calm confidence in God's great purposes; there will be joy in living and fearlessness in dying. Happy are those who can say with Paul, 'I have kept the faith.'²

3. You have kept the faith—that is enough—the *faith*, not all the religious opinions of other days, not the crude notions and thoughts of your youth, not the narrow theology in which you were perhaps trained, not all the phrases and confessions and creeds in which you once delighted. There

are few of you who have not changed greatly in these things. Your beliefs have grown, your thoughts have surely been refined and enlarged, your creed is more beautiful. The love and mercy and Fatherhood of God and the grace of Jesus Christ have assumed lovelier and grander forms. You have left behind much, you have gained still more. But if through all mental change and shifting you have kept the faith, the simple trust in God, the belief in righteousness and its rewards, the reliance on a mercy that covers all our unworthiness and sins, the hold on Jesus Christ as the Master of the soul, as the Divine One who gave Himself for our sins, as the Risen One who lives for ever to help us in the struggle and to give us victory over death—then it is well.

I beseech you, young men, to keep the faith. I am not pleading for any blind adherence to tradition for tradition's sake. Let your faith grow with growing knowledge and ripen with the experience of life. I am pleading for that living, spiritual power, that conviction of the truth and that sense of the universal reality of God and of Christ as the only Saviour, which is rightly called 'the faith,' and by which alone you can resist the evil and attain to the final good. This is the shield by which you may quench the fiery darts of the wicked one. This is the treasure by guarding which you will become fit for the enjoyment of heaven and a victor in the present battle of life. Behold the dying apostle, smiling amid his martyrdom, as he catches sight of the crown of righteousness waiting to adorn his brow; and let it give force to the words which Christ sent to His people in their temptation: 'Hold fast that thou hast: let no man take thy crown.'³

Not in the footsteps of old generations
Our feet may tread; but high compelling spirits,
Ineluctable laws point the untrodden way
Precipitous, urge to the uncharted sea.⁴

4. To hold to Christ till the end is to win in the battle of life. In Watts' picture of the 'Happy Warrior' we see what that triumphant end is. He is pictured as slain in battle. He has fallen in the thickest of the fight. Like the greatest Life ever lived, he failed as the world counts failure. But he succeeded in achieving the high end which he had set before him, beyond the range of most men's touch and sight. And out of his saddest experiences had come the purest joy known to humanity. And now in the article of death, the pain vanishes, the darkness disappears, the fear subsides. There is a great calm in his soul. His helmet falls back from his head; and an angelic

¹ J. Cross, *Old Wine and New*, 146.

² J. G. Greenhough, *The Cross in Modern Life*, 226.

³ G. T. Purves, *Faith and Life*, 305.

⁴ *The Collected Poems of Margaret L. Woods*, 15.

form, the fair symbol of his aspiration, as the shining heaven above him opens to receive his parting spirit, bends over him and imprints the kiss of everlasting peace upon his brow.¹

I challenged and I kept the Faith,
The bleeding path alone I trod;
It darkens. Stand about my wraith,
And harbour me—almighty God!²

Sixth Sunday after Trinity.

THE STRUGGLE OF FAITH.

'The trial of your faith.'—1 P 1⁷.

1. There is, first of all, the rest of faith. There is the rest of faith in the apprehension of Christ's atoning work, and in our own pardon through Him and acceptance in Him. There is the rest of faith in the fulfilment of His word, that as we have yielded ourselves to Him, so He has come in to reign and to rule.

2. But this is the beginning of a lifelong stretching out to reach the heights He has shown to us. All the metaphors of the New Testament make this clear, that life is something more than rest, than indolence, that the one who has come into relationship with Jesus Christ is committed to a life of strenuous endeavour.

For, just as the child that is born among the cold, wintry mountains, and accustomed to exposure, is likely to be hardy and robust; just as the character that is formed amid difficulties, and built up over conquered temptations, is likely to be stable and steadfast when these things are safely past; and just as the nation that has fought long and hard for its liberties is not likely to let them go: so the faith that has to struggle its way upward, amid manifold doubts and much despondency, may become a very strong faith after all, 'more precious than gold that . . . is proved by fire' (1 P 1⁷).

3. True, we must not always be plucking up salvation by the root to see if it is firm; but we must (at least the Church must) keep verifying it, testing it and our faith in it. We must keep adjusting our compass, by asking always, and showing, if it is still equal to the new moral situation, and still lord of the new problems of life. Faith can only exist as an inner warfare. That is why the easy Christian public hates apologetics,

and calls them mere polemics. But we can keep our faith only by constant reconquest. Our certainty must move on with our enlarging personality and our waxing world. As a life it is a constant decision of our soul, a constant functioning of our life-decision in new conditions; it is not a mere relapse upon a decision we made years ago. To possess our souls we must always be mastering our souls. The sure Christ of our frolic youth would not be a sufficient certainty for our tragic old age.

Faith, the belief which saves, is not to be preserved without a struggle. It is not a conclusion which comes automatically from evidence presented. A hundred times a day suggestions are made within us to abandon this or that result we have achieved with much effort, and we are not then to balance but to hold fast with claws.³

4. The aim of the larger faith is necessarily threefold. There is, first of all, the upward aim towards the fullest possible apprehension of God; then there is the inward aim, toward the attainment of as perfect a Christian character as is possible for us this side of the pearly gates; and, thirdly, there is the outward aim toward the accomplishment of the service to which we have been commissioned by our Lord.

'Follow me,' Jesus said; and they uprose. Peter and Andrew rose and followed Him, Followed Him even to Heaven through death most grim, And through a long hard life without repose, Save in the grand ideal of its close.

'Take up your cross and come with Me,' He said, And the world listens yet through all her dead, And still would answer had we faith like those. But who can light again such beacon-fire? With gladsome haste and with rejoicing souls— How would men gird themselves for the emprise? Leaving their black boats by the dead lake's mire, Leaving their slimy nets by the cold shoals, Leaving their old oars, nor once turn their eyes.⁴

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

THE BATTLE AND THE VICTORY.

'Fight the good fight of faith.'—1 Ti 6¹².

No one can hear or read these words without some response of sympathy, whether the response is felt in his kindled imagination or his consenting conscience; whether his future life glows with the prismatic hues of youthful romance, or reflects the white light of sober reality. Even if we chance to listen to them in an ordinary mood, they arrest the

¹ H. Macmillan, *G. F. Watts*, 185.

² H. Belloc, *Verses*, 33.

³ Mark Rutherford, *Last Pages from a Journal*, 302.

⁴ W. Bell Scott.

attention, and move the feelings. Much more, if they meet us squarely at one of the halting or turning places of life, and we think of what we have been or done in the past, and what we may be or do in the future.

There is a great deal in the Bible about soldiers and fighting, especially in the Epistles written by St. Paul. We find that when he wants to explain a matter by an illustration, he constantly takes something connected with military life—the armour of soldiers, or the habits of soldiers—and thus makes clear the truth which he wishes to teach. St. Paul lived a great part of his life in towns where he would frequently have seen the Roman troops, and so all these things were quite familiar to him and to his readers. Here, the Apostle says, life is a battle; and he exhorts Timothy—whom he calls his son in the faith, because he had converted him to Christ's religion—to fight the good fight of faith.¹

1. We win this fight, first, by clinging to Christ. To Christ—not to the unseen and spiritual in general.

He fought his doubts and gathered strength,
He faced the spectres of the mind,
And laid them;
not by parleying with them; no, by simply casting himself in his helplessness on Him who is mighty to save and strong to deliver. To expect success by turning round to face the doubts whilst we meanwhile let Christ go—a folly of which many are guilty—is as though a drowning man were to let go the lifebelt which keeps him afloat, in order to battle with a foe behind him. Our one safety is to cling as for very life to the unseen Lord whose presence and power we have learnt to hold for true and real.

2. The next thing is constant prayer. The clinging must take place in some form or other; its best form is prayer, at all events its first and most frequent form. 'Pray without ceasing.' 'Be instant in prayer.' We must ask for aid in specific difficulties and perils, against specific impulses and habits, against specific inclinations and temptations; we must pray for the capability to exercise specific virtues and graces; we must pray that we may be strengthened where we are weak, enlightened where we are dark, controlled where we most easily go astray. Yea, mystery of mysteries, we must pray for energy to cling, and just when our hold seems about to loosen, it will become firm as a vice; we must pray to be able to pray, and then our prayer will become a visible and tangible adder up to the very secret place of the Most High.

3. But a third thing is also needed, without which all else will end in failure after failure: we must be willing that God should do all His will in us and by us. Here is our weakness. We reserve, more or less consciously, some little domain or corner of life to be managed by ourselves, and according to our own or worldly notions; and because we shut God out thence, though we would fain have Him elsewhere, He leaves us to stumble and fall, to restlessness and darkness, to a sense of being forsaken and mocked, until it dawns upon us—perhaps at the very brink of an abyss which it would at first have seemed impossible we could ever approach—it dawns upon us that God must have all or none; and that to be entirely God's is the way to freedom, peace, blessedness, and true prosperity.

Virginibus Puerisque.

JULY.

A Beloved Tyrant.

'Be ye strong therefore, and let not your hands be weak: for your work shall be rewarded'—2 Ch 15⁷.

In these July days many of you boys and girls meet the great, strong, masterful monster that can make both big folks and little folks run for fear. Fortunately it is chained, and the boys and girls know it: they laugh all the time they run. Big people generally sit and look on at a safe distance; for while this monster, because of its hugeness and strength, is one of the greatest wonders of this earth of ours, it is very much beloved.

Just think of one of England's greatest writers speaking of it one moment as giving great rough kisses, and the next as rushing upon what comes within reach—it might be a little boy or a little girl—like a great hungry leopard. There is both love and fear in that, is there not? And a very worthy man who used to sit watching it straining at its fetters confessed that it had done more to help him to be good than even the stars up in heaven, and you know how solemn the sight of them sometimes makes you feel. He said too, that if he had not come to know God, the very bigness and strength of this monster would have made him its worshipper.

A great many people have loved it; and that may be why it has come to be spoken of as *She*. There are poets who even go the length of calling

¹ T. Teignmouth-Shore, *Saint George for England*, 18.

it 'mother.' There was once a very great poet who did not love his own mother. He felt she did not understand him. Certainly she said very unkind things to him when he was little, things which he could never forget. But he found a friend in this fettered giant and *She* somehow made him think of God as nothing else could. Have you guessed her name? You have run from her many a time, but you were never really frightened; you knew you could easily get beyond her reach. Haven't you built sand castles—perhaps even a strong fort, and then feeling very happy have sat down with your chums beside it. But after a half-day's real holiday fun you saw the enemy drawing nearer and nearer. He (now I call him 'he') had a great army with him, and they wore white caps.

A fort we built upon the sands,
We boys and baby brother Paul,
We shaped it with our busy hands,
And squared the ramparts and the wall.

We held it bravely half a day,
No enemy durst venture by;
But as the morning wore away
We saw the foe was drawing nigh!

He led with him a countless host,
Far farther than the eye could reach.
Their haughty heads they proudly tossed,
And mustered all along the beach.

And all the while their music played
A march so wild and strange and sweet,
The best drum that was ever made
So loud and stirring could not beat.

And near and nearer still they drew,
And shouted like the thunder's roar;
Their uniform was brightest blue,
And caps as white as snow they wore.

We stood our ground like valiant men,
But fast and faster on rushed they
Until they reached the fort, and then,
To tell the truth—we ran away!¹

The sea is the sort of teacher boys and girls need—a teacher who, although he loves them, makes them work. He keeps saying, 'Peg away! Don't get disheartened although things go wrong with you. Just try, try, try again.' And with that he destroys a whole morning's work. We get other castles than sand ones demolished. We are

¹ E. H. Thomas, *The Story of a Fort*.

constantly finding ourselves in positions to get out of which requires all the courage we can command.

You know how, when trench after trench had been taken from our soldiers, they stuck to their posts. Their spirit of hope gave us a new catchword, 'Are we down-hearted? No!'

One day a boy named Tommy was flying his kite. The string snapped and the kite flew far away out of sight. Tommy stood still for a moment and then went home whistling. 'Why Tommy,' a friend said, 'aren't you sorry to lose your kite?'

'Yes, but what's the use, I'll just have to make another.'

It was the same when he broke his leg.

'Poor Tommy,' his sister cried, 'you can't play any more!'

'I'm not poor. I'll have plenty of time to whistle. Besides, when I get well I'll beat everybody in the class at arithmetic. I keep saying the multiplication table over and over again till it makes me sleepy, when my leg is painful.'

That boy had begun life with our text as a motto. Can you not do the same?

The Man who liked to be First.

'Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them.'—3 Jn⁹.

Some years ago I visited an industrial exhibition in one of our large cities. The exhibition was held in a big public park and there were many interesting and curious things to be seen. There was a huge industrial hall where you could see all sorts of wonderful things in process of manufacture, and where the whirr of the wheels and the throb of the engines was so tremendous that you had to shout to make yourself heard. There was a beautiful picture gallery where some of the finest pictures in the world had been collected. There were buildings containing strange exhibits from all parts of the globe. There was an Irish village where Irish peasants were at work on lace and embroidery, and where everything was included except the pig. There was an immense concert hall where splendid concerts were given, and there were band-stands in the open air where some of the most famous bands in the world played.

The first day I visited the exhibition I was talking to a friend outside one of the buildings when all at once there was a piercing shriek quite

ear, and then something tore past us panting and puffing and snorting. What do you suppose it was?—It was a toy engine followed by a toy train, and in the toy train there were dozens of boys and girls going for a 'joy ride.' That engine made us laugh. It was so fussy and important. It seemed to say, 'I am the Exhibition. Look at me. You won't see anything so fine in a hurry again, and just observe how hard I am working.' And yet it never got anywhere. It only carried a few toy carriages backwards and forwards over two or three hundred yards of toy rails. It would have been utterly useless for pulling a heavy goods train, or carrying passengers up hill and down dale, over difficult ground.

Now there are some people who are like that toy engine. They make a great deal of noise and fuss. They like to be important, they like everybody to look at them, but they do very little real good in the world. Diotrephes, the man who is mentioned in our text, was one of those people. He liked to have the pre-eminence among the Christians in his church. And that just means that he liked to have the first place. He liked to boss everybody, he liked everybody to defer to his opinion, and he was very angry when anybody tried to interfere with him.

When John, who was the real head of his church, sent missionaries to it bearing a letter from himself, Diotrephes refused to receive them. But he didn't stop there. Perhaps he was jealous of John and of his influence. Perhaps he thought the apostle had not taken enough notice of him. At any rate he began to say nasty things about him. He said things that were unkind and untrue. Then he went on to forbid the other people in the church to receive the messengers John had sent. And all because he wanted to be first. You see to what lengths his love of power and self-importance led him.

Now I think most of us are inclined to be a little like Diotrephes. We all like to be first. Fortunately, most of us have brothers and sisters at home and companions at school to take the nonsense out of us, or we should turn into very horrid people indeed.

There is a sense in which this desire to be first is a good desire. It is good to wish to make the very best of yourself—to do your very best work and win the very best place you can. The boys and girls who have a good ambition are kept from

many mean and unworthy things. But this desire to be first is not good when it makes you vain and selfish. It is not a good thing when it makes you forget the rights and feelings of other people, when it makes you over-bearing, and self-important, and unkind.

Diotrephes called himself a follower of Jesus, but I think he must have forgotten that Jesus told His disciples that he who wanted to be chief among them must be ready to serve others. Do you know the finest thing you can do? It is not to carry off prizes or make a great name for yourself. It is just to serve other people by kind and loving deeds.

Once a missionary in China sent home for an assistant. A young man appeared before the committee as a candidate, but he seemed so unlikely that they said he would never do. Then they thought he might do for a servant, so they asked him if he would be willing to be that. And the young man replied cheerfully, 'Certainly. To be "a hewer of wood and a drawer of water" is too great an honour for me when the Lord's house is building.'

The true followers of Jesus are glad to do even the humblest work for Him. It is a good thing to be first. It is a finer thing to be able to take the second place sweetly and cheerfully. But the greatest honour of all is just to take the lowest place and to help others with humble and loving service.

The Ruby.

'More precious than rubies.'—Pr 3¹⁵.

July is—or should be—a month of warm glowing sunshine, and the July stone is a warm glowing gem—the ruby.

The ruby is the rarest of the precious stones, and a perfect ruby brings a price three times as great as a diamond of the same size. The ruby is made of a material called corundum, and it has two cousins the sapphire and the Oriental topaz, which are corundum but with different colouring. Though we may not have heard the word 'corundum,' we all know one variety of corundum. We often beg some from mother when we want to polish up any steel that has rusted; for emery paper is made of grains of corundum, and these grains are far-away cousins of the ruby and the sapphire.

Our finest rubies come from Upper Burma. That is the natural home of the gem. Indeed, the earliest rubies known to history came from the Burmese mines. Till 1886 these mines were worked by natives who jealously guarded their secrets. But in 1886 Burma was annexed by Britain, and after that date the mines were taken over by a British company who, for the privilege of working them, pay a huge sum every year to the Indian Government.

From Siam too come rubies, and the King of Siam styles himself 'Lord of the Rubies.' But the rubies of Siam are darker and less pure in colour than those of Burma. Rubies are found also in small quantities in Ceylon, Australia, and the United States; but the same holds good of all—they are inferior to their Burmese brothers.

Rubies are of every shade of red from pale rose to deep crimson, but the most valuable are of the shade known as 'pigeon's blood.' The test of the colour of a ruby used to be placing it on a white paper beside a drop of fresh pigeon's blood, and that is why to-day people speak of pigeon's blood rubies.

The ruby has always been a royal stone and a favourite of kings. There is a great ruby among the English crown jewels. It was given to the Black Prince in the year 1367 by Don Pedro, King of Castile, and it was worn in the helmet of Henry V. at the battle of Agincourt. It is said to be worth £100,000.

Although the ruby is so rare, it has many stones which closely resemble it—such as the garnet and the spinel. Sometimes only experts are able to tell the difference. If the expert is in doubt he takes an instrument called a dichroscope and examines the stone through it. The dichroscope makes him see double. It gives him two images of the same stone. If the one image be orange-red and the other carmine-red, then the expert knows he is looking at a real ruby, for the garnet and the spinel do not show two colours under the dichroscope.

If you hunt up in the Bible all the texts that speak of rubies you will notice they nearly all tell you that *wisdom* is more precious than rubies. Now, I quite agree that wisdom is a precious thing, but there is something more precious than the wisest wisdom, more precious than gold or silver or diamonds or rubies—and yet we all can have it. What is it? Why, just *love*! So wherever you see 'wisdom' compared to rubies I want you to change the word to 'love.' The ruby is a splendid

stone with which to compare love. Wisdom is a cold sort of thing, and to me it seems to compare best with a green stone, but love!—why love should be red and warm and glowing like the ruby! And besides that, if we need another reason, the ruby is supposed among precious stones to be the symbol of love.

So the ruby's message to us is 'Love.' Yes, but love of the right sort, love that stands the test of the dichroscope, love that divides in two. What do I mean by that? Let me tell you in a story.

A teacher was once trying to explain love to a class of tiny tots. She knew it was no use to give them an explanation out of a dictionary, so she asked instead if any of them could show her what love meant. At first they were all silent. Then one little maiden of six rose shyly from her seat, flung her arms round the teacher's neck, gave her a good hug and said, 'That's love.' 'Yes,' said the teacher, and smiled. 'That's love. But love is something more. Can you show me what more love is?' The little girl thought a minute or two. Then she began to set the chairs in order, to clear the board, to tidy away the papers and books, and to sponge the slates. When she had finished and everything was in order she said, 'Love is helping people too.'

That little girl was right. Love is not only hugging, it is helping. It is not merely saying, it is doing. Some boys and girls—and I'm sorry to say some grown-up people as well—seem to think that love ends with hugging, and saying, 'I love you heaps and heaps.' That is quite a good way of showing love, and some folks don't do nearly enough of it. This world would be a happier place if there were a little more hugging and telling people that we loved them. But that is only one half of love, it is only one image of the ruby, the orange-red. It leaves out the other image, the carmine-red, and without it we cannot have real love any more than we can have a real ruby. The love that stops at words and doesn't go on to deeds is not, after all, worth much.

In Scotland they sometimes say of a person, 'Oh! So-and-so is very agreeable, but he *wouldn't put himself about* for you.' That means he would not go out of his way or give himself any trouble to do you a kindness. Boys and girls, I want you all to *put yourselves about* for others. I want you to help as well as to hug, to do as well as to say, to serve—which is the better part of love.

The Problem of Pain and Suffering.

BY THE REV. F. R. TENNANT, D.D., LECTURER IN THEOLOGY AND FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE existence of evil, physical and moral, is a standing difficulty for all kinds of philosophy which regard the world as rational, and has been wont to be called the *crux* of Theism especially, because that system regards the world as the expression of intelligent purpose emanating from one wholly good Will. And the problem has been brought home to us all, and perhaps to many for the first time, by the horrors of the recent war. Some theists, like Lotze, have professed ignorance as to how it is to be solved; and certainly it is one of the commonest grounds on which Theism, and indeed the Christian Faith, are rejected. In a previous paper on 'Recent Moral Arguments for Theism,' I indicated that a change of view as to the intractableness of this problem was characteristic of recent theistic literature, the standpoint being adopted that Theism alone, among the greater attempts to interpret the world and its meaning, can adequately account for the evil which abounds in it. That the difficulty is at any rate not insuperable is now to be contended more fully. In the present article the explanation of physical pain and suffering is to be attempted, and in a subsequent paper the existence of moral evil will be dealt with.

The many indictments of the world as bad with which we are familiar have all proceeded from a hedonistic point of view. The world has been pronounced evil, that is to say, because it is so far from being the pleasantest or the most enjoyable that our mind can conceive; and from its badness, in this sense, is referred sometimes its Godlessness, its inconsistency with the belief in a God such as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But it is not pleasure or unmixed enjoyment that constitutes the highest good or gives the highest worth to human life. If that were so, assuredly we should have to admit that the world was hopelessly bad, and that its Author had no care for humanity. But the highest worth is moral character, capacity to appreciate, and to hold communion, and to co-operate, with God. The world is to be pronounced good or bad, then, worthy or unworthy of God and of man who bears or can

attain to the likeness of God, according as it provides or does not provide for a moral order and moral progress; for these are the best things conceivable in any such world as ours. To dispense with them would imply Divine preference for a worse world rather than for a better. God's love does not mean indulgent fondness; it rather consists in self-revelation and self-communication to finite beings whom He would educate to sonship, and seeks their highest welfare. And if we find reason to believe that in a finite evolutionary world such as ours, that highest welfare cannot conceivably be secured without the entailing of suffering—even so much suffering as humanity is here called upon to bear—we can look upon the world as 'very good' and upon God as Love, not so much in spite of, as because of, the manifold evils attendant upon our possession of the status of morality and sonship. We have advanced one step towards the solution of the problem of pain if we have decided that by 'good' we mean not 'enjoyable' in the animal sense, but 'of ethical value,' and if we are prepared to abide by that meaning and that meaning alone. We certainly cannot have it both ways: the pleasantest world cannot be the best, nor the best the most pleasurable while it is in the making.

The word 'cannot' leads us to another conception which plays an important part in the reconciliation of the world's evil with God's goodness, viz. the idea of omnipotence. I am to deal later with the topic of Divine omnipotence, and here I will only remark that almighty does not include self-inconsistency or obliteration of the distinction between possibility and impossibility. God is not wholly indeterminate; He has a nature, and that nature He 'cannot' violate; He 'cannot' realize a contradiction: so much of limitation, at all events, we must impose upon our conception of omnipotence. And granted this, we have now the two presuppositions from which we may set out on our attempt to show that physical evil in our world is a logically necessary precondition of the realization of man's highest good, and consequently of the display of the Divine love.

It is not enough for our purpose to show that particular sufferings are sometimes educational and chastening, punitive, or preventive of worse evils. This may be true, but it only touches the fringe of our problem. For the question will always arise, Why the remoter evil, the general situation, which makes the painful remedy or discipline necessary or salutary? We need to prove that pain, in a world such as ours, is a logical necessity: that its non-existence would be contradictory of the nature of God, because suffering is the inevitable outcome of a developing moral order.

Now a world which is to be a moral order must in the first place be an intelligible cosmos; it must be characterized by uniformity or law. Without regularity in nature, there could be no intelligence in man, no room for prediction or prudence, for formation of habit or character, for progress or civilization; no possibility of morality. This will hardly be doubted, but its truth is often lost sight of when the problem of evil is under discussion. It is perhaps the key to that problem. The reign of law, then, is a logical condition of the highest good. But we cannot have the advantages of a uniform order without the disadvantages; this too is simply a matter of logic. Uniformity in nature involves that things have fixed and determinate properties, that, e.g., the water which cleanses and quenches thirst shall also be capable of flooding our fields and drowning us. For this to be made otherwise would require perpetual miracle; that is to say, an end to all the ordered experience and science on which the conduct of rational and moral life depends. God does not will our physical ills directly and as such; He does, however, directly will the moral order to which they would seem to be necessarily incidental. That there could be a determinate evolutionary world from which all events that happen to be painful to man were excluded, a law-abiding world which at the same time yielded unalloyed comfort and happiness, is a proposition the burden of proving which belongs to those who would argue from the evil of the world to its godlessness. From all we know about our world, such proof would seem impossible; and certainly it is not forthcoming. Physical evils, we conclude, follow with the same rigorous necessity as physical goods from that determinateness and regularity without which our world would be no stage for intelligent and moral life. The existence of such evil is no

sign of lack of either goodness or power in the Creator; it is simply the inevitable outcome of coherency in the world's structure and self-consistency in the Divine nature.

It follows, then, that the physical ills to which our flesh is heir are not absolute or superfluous evils. They are not absolute evils because they are part of an order which suberves man's highest good in providing for his moral status and his moral development; and they are not superfluous because they are a *necessary* outcome of that order. They are to be regarded as collateral effects or by-products of an order which itself has instrumental value of the highest kind, because it is indispensable for the attainment of the highest good of man.

This seems to me not only to be the ultimate truth of the matter, in so far as our thought can penetrate to ultimate truth at all, but also to offer a more satisfactory theodicy or vindication of the goodness of God than other views which perhaps are more commonly entertained. The theory as to the necessariness of evil to the working out of God's world-purpose which I have ventured to submit, conflicts no doubt with the view of simple-minded and simple-hearted piety, according to which all particular evils which happen to individuals are expressly 'sent' to accomplish a particular purpose, or are Divine 'visitations.' And it is with no desire to deal otherwise than reverently and tenderly with this expression of simple piety, or to remove a ground for belief without substituting a better one, that I proceed to call the popular view in question. Doubtless it is applicable to a large class of physical sufferings, whether it be true or not; but there are some cases where, as it seems to me, it breaks down or becomes intolerable. I refer, for instance, to the excruciating agony of tetanus or cancer, and to the birth of abortions and individuals of insane mind. In the latter case we have before us an affliction which is inexplicable on the view that every form of suffering to which man is liable is a particular providence, a directly willed Divine dispensation for the chastening and perfecting of the personality upon whom the affliction falls; and in the former we are presented with tortures which in all reverence we must judge to be excessive for the evocation of patience and fortitude. We could not feel sure that much human suffering is not superfluous if it were to be explained solely as a means to elicit

virtues such as self-control, sympathy, etc., which the bearing of pain undoubtedly tends in many cases to engender. And, once more, there remains that which is perhaps the hardest fact of all for our equanimity, namely, the distribution of afflictions among individuals. This seems to our intelligence so irreconcilable with any divine plan of adjustment of particular sufferings to the particular needs, stages of moral development, circumstances, and characters, of individual sufferers. If only we could discern any kind of adaptation in quantity and quality of pain to the individual's power to bear it for profit by it, to his need of awakening or of chastening, then we might assign a special purpose to every instance of affliction, however grievous. But our experience is rather such as that to which the writer of Ecclesiastes gave expression: 'All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked.' And this makes it difficult, nay, to some intolerable, to believe that the allotment of physical and mental sufferings to human individuals is the calculated action of an immanent God; it doubtless often leads men to 'charge God foolishly.' And this is apart from the further consideration that so elaborate a scheme of particular providences, as the belief in question presupposes, is difficult to distinguish from a 'miscellany of miracles' which would be inconsistent with the general Divine providence expressed in the regularity of nature. For these reasons, then, I would not shrink from recommending the view that human sufferings arising out of the relation in which we stand to the physical world are not allotted, or even directly willed, by God at all; that

God does not 'afflict willingly (*i.e.* from His heart) the children of men'; but that rather all physical ills such as disease, pestilence, floods, and earthquakes are incidental yet inevitable accompaniments of an order of nature and a law-abiding evolutionary world, logical consequences of what may anthropomorphically be called the 'world-plan.'

There remains the question of the worth-while-ness of human suffering: is the possession of the moral status worth the price we have to pay for it in pain? Well, it may surely be said that the human race has with practical unanimity answered in the positive. And it has answered with the less hesitation as moral and religious belief have advanced in purity. Man clings to life even here; and those who believe in a fuller life hereafter will recognize that it is not enough to look only on the things that are seen and are temporal, when weighing against the moral perfection of the race or of the individual its necessary cost in possible ills. Man acquiesces in God's ideal, and the more so as he becomes more godlike. We know that God in fulfilling Himself is fulfilling ourselves also, and fulfilling us for ourselves as well as for Himself. This it is which makes human life, in spite of its burden of trials and sorrows, a thing to be desired, and 'the sufferings of this present time . . . not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed.' Pain is none the less evil for that it shall be compensated, indeed; but its ugliness is transfigured if, while being necessarily involved in a 'best possible' world, it can be regarded as 'but for a moment' in the time-span of just men made perfect.

Contributions and Comments.

Jesus writing on the Ground (John viii. 6-8).

In that well-known pericope, a detail has often exercised the sagacity of commentators: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν . . . καὶ τάλιν κάτω κύψας ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν. What is the meaning of Jesus' action? A remark to be found in an Arab Lexicograph seems to me to throw a new light on this enigmatical passage.¹

¹ Cf. also some Greek examples more or less similar, quoted by Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum graecum . . . ad Joh. viii. 6.*

In his large Arabic Dictionary (the *Lisān al-'Arab*), Djemāl eddīn Mokarram (630/1232-711/1311)² explains thus: 'One is said to be writing on the ground when he is engrossed with deep thoughts and calculations (يَقْالُ فِي الْأَرْضِ إِذَا كَانَ يَفْكِرُ فِي أَمْرٍ وَيَدْبَرُه.'

The writing is the conjurer's writing, viz. he writes with his finger on the ground and infers omen. The conjurer writes on the ground, *i.e.* with his

² Cf. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, vol. ii. p. 21.

finger he draws lines, shaped into writing, and then infers omen.¹ As Dhou'r. Romma has said: in the evening I can do nothing but gather small pebbles [*i.e.* calculating] and write on the ground [*i.e.* conjuring].' Cf. Lisân, vol. ix. p. 158, Boulag 1300-1307.

According to this quotation Jesus is either decidedly given as a conjurer in Jn 8⁶⁻⁸, or we have here only to deal with an expression that has lost its primitive and precise significance, now meaning metaphorically that the Master was deep in His thoughts, or, that at last, Jesus showed by a gesture, which everybody would understand as it was in a way a sort of ritual gesture, His intense meditation.

A Persian expression might also be taken into consideration, though certainly less conclusive: 'to write on the ground,' *i.e.* to acknowledge his incompetency.

خط بر خاک (Kashidân), explained by Vullers as: 'impotentiam vel pudorem manifestare' (cf. Vullers, *Lexicon persico-latinum*, vol. i. p. 706).

The Arabic witness of the Lisân, however, deserves by its very preciseness to be compared with the evangelical text, and corroborates Loisy's explanation: 'The meaning lies not so much in the writing, as in the gesture itself.'²

PAUL HUMBERT.

University of Neuchâtel.

Dr. Field's Old Testament Revision Notes.

TRANSCRIBED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MS. BY THE
REV. JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D.

IV.

EXODUS 17¹⁶. Render: 'for he said, Because there is a monument by the throne of the LORD: War to the LORD with Amalek from generation to generation.' Or, 'Because the LORD hath sworn that the LORD will have war with Amalek,' etc. The correction of סָבָב for סָבָב, besides being purely conjectural, does not seem to me to clear up the difficulty of the sentence. If יָד retain its usual meaning of 'hand,' the question arises, whose hand is intended? which the context leaves ambiguous. I have proposed to take יָד in the undoubted sense of a 'memorial,' or 'monument'—whether for the dead (as 'Absalom's hand') or (as here and

¹ The poet Ghailân b. 'Oqba (+107/719); cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.* vol. i. p. 59.

1 S 15¹²) for a victory in war. The יָד may have been an inscribed *stile* (cp. 2 Reg. 18¹⁸ in LXX), and the second clause may be intended for the inscription itself. V.¹⁶ will then be exactly parallel with v.¹⁴; and the monument set up in heaven will correspond with the 'written memorial' preserved on earth. It is a coincidence that the 'hand' or 'monument' set up by Saul in 1 S 15¹ was for a victory over these same Amalekites.

EXODUS 22²⁵. If 'usurer' be objected to, I would substitute 'money-lender.' If you lend money to a person, you can't help being his 'creditor.'

EXODUS 22²⁹. This is the way in which the Hebrew מִלְאָחָה וְרַמְעָה is generally understood. Coverdale to the same effect, but more tersely: 'Thy dry and moist fruits shalt thou not keep back.' The objections to this version are: (1) מִלְאָחָה is not restricted to *dry fruits*, since in Nu 18²⁷ we find, 'the corn of the threshing-floor, and the fulness (מִלְאָה) of the winepress' (2). רַמְעָה (a form only used in this place) seems a strange expression for 'what flows from the wine or oil press,' and is by no means warranted by the Greek usage of τὰ δάκρυα τῶν δένδρων, not to mention that no Greek writer would use δάκρυα for 'gums' when there is nothing in the context about trees or plants. If the usual sense of the passage must be retained, I think old Coverdale's version greatly superior to that of the A.V.; and would propose (for further consideration, as an alternative version): 'Thine abundance and thy prime (or, best) shalt thou not keep back.' In the Samaritan dialect רַמְעָה is used here and in other places (e.g. Gn 45¹⁸, 'the best of the land of Egypt'; Nu 18²⁹, 'of all the best thereof': Heb. מִלְאָחָה—Sam.

Vers. מִכְלָה רַמְעָה (מִכְלָה for *optimum*, *praestantissimum* *cujusque rei*, a sense which seems very suitable to this place. If יְמִינָה really means 'liquor,' I would understand 'the juice which oozed by the simple weight of the bunches into the lower vat, before the process of treading, which was collected first, and supplied the richest and best wine, as the "drop port" is still reserved in the vintage of Portugal and highly esteemed' (Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 409). It is not impossible that the ἄποξ λεγ. יְמִינָה may have been the technical word for this juice, and that the Samaritan usage may have been derived from it. But this is only a speculation, and the objection to מִלְאָחָה still remains. 'Heb. thy fulness and thy tear' might be added in the margin.

² Loisy, *Le quatrième Evangile*, p. 546.

EXODUS 23⁵. I should object to יְבַרֵּךְ being used in two different senses (as Keil, Gesenius, etc.) in the first and second members, as a *lusus verborum* which seems out of place in a legal document; nor is it necessary, if we take תְּלַבֵּת either (as in ext of A.V.) for 'and wouldest forbear,' or (as in margin) for 'wouldest thou forbear?' I prefer the latter, with Gataker, *Adv. Misc.*, p. 183. (*non sine admiratione aliqua: an tam durus et inhumanus existeris*, etc.). Then, adopting the abnormal sense of *vincula laxare* attributed to בְּרַע, we might trans-

late: 'wouldest thou forbear to release *it* for him (thine enemy)? Nay, but thou shalt surely release *it* with him.' The alternative, 'and wouldest cease to leave *thy business* for him,' etc. (which is Piscator's), might be omitted.

EXODUS 35²². 'Necklaces' is probably the meaning of the A.V. 'tablets,' which is not in Todd's *Johnson*; but in Ebers' *English-German Dictionary*, 1794, I find: 'Tablet—das Halsband, auch Armband.' So the Peschito uses here a word which is interchanged with the Greek words μανιάκης, κλοιός, ὄρμίσκος.

Entre Nous.

A TEXT.

Matt. xviii. 15-17.

It seems to be possible for an American to write without making it known that he is an American. Mr. Herbert S. Houston has done it. In a little book which he has called *Blocking New Wars* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net) he writes simply literary English. The book was written some time before the present situation, but very little of it is out of date; for it is a book of principle rather than of practice.

In the middle of the book Mr. Houston suddenly arrests his own hand and offers us a chapter from Dr. Lyman Abbott. It is an article which Dr. Abbott published in the *Outlook*. It is really a sermon on Mt 18¹⁵⁻¹⁷. The words of the text are, 'And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.'

This is the introduction: To treat a man as a heathen man and a publican or Roman tax-gatherer was simply to have no dealings with him. The heathen were not subjected to penalties of any sort in Judea; the Jews simply had no intercourse with them. The meaning, then, of Christ's ultimatum, as it would have been understood by his disciples, would be: If your fellow-member defies the public opinion of the Christian community to which you both belong, have nothing more to do with him.

The great statesmen of the world, horrified by this terrible world war, are endeavouring to find some better method for the settlement of inter-

national difficulties than "wager of battle," and curiously, and as it seems to me very significantly, have hit upon the method which Christ commanded to his disciples nineteen centuries ago. If I interpret Christ's counsel correctly, these statesmen are following Christ, whether they know it or not. For, if we apply the spirit of his counsel to international action, it would mean, first, Diplomacy; second, Arbitration; third, Judicial Procedure; fourth, to enforce such procedure, Non-intercourse.

So the divisions are:

1. *Diplomacy*.—If in the community of nations a controversy arises between two or more of them, the first step toward a settlement is diplomacy—that is, personal negotiation between the two nations. The object of this negotiation should be to gain a brother. Its spirit and its purpose should be pacific; its aim, to find some common ground on which the two nations can agree. Austria had a complaint against Serbia. The Austrian Crown Prince had been assassinated, and the Austrian Government believed that the Serbian Government had been accessory to the assassination. If the charge was true, the trespass committed by the Serbian Government was very great. But Austria showed no desire in her negotiations to gain a brother. She treated Serbia as a criminal. She went with a demand in one hand and a threat in the other. And the demand was one to which no nation could accede under threat, without, by that very act, surrendering her independence.

Christ also advises that these negotiations between the complainant and the supposed transgressor be private. "Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." Recently there has been in certain quarters a great outcry against secret diplomacy. There has been in this country some demand, though not very widespread or influential, for the abolition of the secret sessions of

the Senate. It is said that secret negotiations have led to wars, and that, if all negotiations were conducted in the open, war would be avoided. And it is probably true that some wars have been prepared for, and perhaps promoted, by secret negotiations.

But it is certain that wars have often been prevented by secret negotiations. There are many international questions which cannot be discussed in the open forum without arousing popular prejudices and exciting popular passions. There is a strong popular feeling in this country against unlimited Japanese immigration. There is a strong popular feeling in Japan hostile to American discrimination against Japanese immigrants. Popular discussion in the press of America excites race prejudice against the Japanese. Popular discussion in the press of Japan excites race prejudice against the Americans. There would be little danger of war between the two countries if we could only unite our forces in a successful war against the yellow press of both countries. If the Japanese question could be taken out of the public forum, there is little doubt that, by friendly negotiations between the Japanese mission now in this country and our President representing the Democratic party and Elihu Root representing the Republican party, an agreement could be reached which would calm the excessive self-esteem of the one people and the excessive fears of the other.

2. *Arbitration*.—If diplomacy quietly conducted between the two parties in a spirit of mutual brotherhood fails, arbitration is the next step in Christ's league to enforce peace. It is evident that the two or three witnesses are to hear both sides of the incipient quarrel. Their opinion is to be listened to by both parties to the quarrel. There is, indeed, no suggestion that they possess authority to decide. Authoritative decision is reserved for the third stage in this proceeding toward peace. But they are not partisans of the complainant taken by him to overbear the accused. They are witnesses, taken to hear the story, to reach their conclusion upon it, and, if no agreement can be reached by their aid, to report to the constituent assembly their judgment upon the undetermined issue. My readers will remember how urgent were the entreaties of England, France, Italy, and Russia to Germany and Austria to submit the issue between Austria and Serbia either to the Hague Tribunal for decision or to a conference of the Powers for amicable settlement, and how emphatic and almost contemptuous was the refusal.

3. *Judicial Procedure*.—This was as far as Christian civilisation had gone in 1914 in its preparations to avoid war. Reformers had urged the constitution of a supreme court of nations to

which any nation might be summoned to give account of its claims. But no such court had been constituted. The imperfectly organised Hague Tribunal could pass only on such questions as were submitted to it by the consent of both the parties to the controversy. Christ recommended to his disciples a further step—the creation of some sort of body—Parliament, Congress, Supreme Court, Constituent Assembly, Ecclesia—to which either party could report its complaint, a body which would have power to declare an authoritative judgment.

4. *Non-intercourse*.—And if the other party would not accept the judgment, what then?—war to enforce the decision? No! Non-intercourse. If he will not hear the assembly let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Let us imagine that in 1914 the eighteen nations now in alliance against the Central Powers had constituted a community of nations; that they had an international tribunal or assembly with power to hear and decide international questions; and that when Germany and Austria refused to submit the issue between Austria and Serbia to decision by that tribunal, the Powers had instantly and automatically pronounced a decree of non-intercourse. What would have happened? Every foreign ambassador in Germany and Austria would have been called home. Every German and Austrian ambassador would have been sent home. The mails between other countries and Germany and Austria would have been suspended. Telegrams of every description would have ceased. The world's ports would have been hermetically sealed against the offender. No exports could have passed from the Central Powers to other countries, no imports could have passed from other countries into their territories. Germany and Austria would have been as effectually isolated as if they had been transported bodily to Mars. The present blockade, which is threatening to bring Germany to her knees, would be insignificant by the side of such a world blockade. What nation would venture to defy it? What nation defying it once would ever venture to defy it a second time?

It is true that such a league as is here foreshadowed would not absolutely prevent war. Germany might have invaded Holland, Belgium, France in the west, and Russia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Rumania in the east, to get by her arms the supplies which commerce refused to her. It might have been necessary to unite the armies of the world in defence of the right to decree and enforce non-intercourse against a defiant nation. But if such a league had existed in 1914, it would not have required three years of robbery on the land and piracy on the sea to call it into existence.

If any ecclesiastical reader is inclined to think

that the counsels embodied in the passage here interpreted and applied to international affairs were intended by Christ simply as a direction for Church discipline, I must refer him to my Commentary on Matthew for a statement of the reasons why I cannot agree with him ; if any reader thinks they were intended only for the settlement of private disputes, I reply that the same principles apply to the settlement of disputes between organisations as between individuals. If any one thinks it extraordinary that the world should not have long since discovered and adopted Christ's league to enforce peace, if it is really suggested by his teaching, I reply that he who believes, as I do, that Jesus Christ is the divine leader of mankind will not think it extraordinary that he should still be in advance of the age and waiting patiently for his disciples to overtake him.

SOME TOPICS.

Don't Worry.

THERE is but one remedy—never harp on business and dollars after working hours, never go to a theatre and permit the mind to wander off on personal affairs which have nothing to do with recreation, never discuss personal matters when you are playing games, never worry over things that you cannot alter, and, above all, learn to play some musical instrument and engage the mental faculties in something the exact opposite to that which engaged the attention during business hours.¹

Endor and London.

Professor W. R. Sorley of Cambridge has published three lay sermons on *Reconstruction and the Renewal of Life* (Cambridge : at the University Press). They are, one and all, a plea for the spiritual against the material—for life against organization, for faith against sight, for insight into the present against prediction of the future. In the sermon on Vision he says: 'Perhaps the greatest enemy of true religion has, all along, been the claim to vision which is not based on an understanding of the really vital forces of history. Especially in periods of crisis and calamity, troubled minds have always been eager to see behind the veil ; and, from the time of the witch of Endor to the London medium of our own day, they have found instruments willing to pierce it for them—at a price. The test of all these revelations is their result. They picture the world beyond as a pale reflexion of the material conditions of the present. And they show no genuine vision, for they have no real insight into the moral forces

which now fight for mastery and in which lies the promise of the future.'

A Begging Letter.

In the biography of Joel Chandler Harris we are told that a rumour got out after the success of Uncle Remus that the author had become wealthy. The result was a steady flow of begging letters. Here is one of them : 'It came from a man living in a small Georgia town, and he wrote : "Le's be up and doing ! I'll head the list with \$5.00 for my father's tombstone. A little tombstone is all that is needed. What will you give ?"

NEW POETRY.

Cornelia Steketee Hulst.

The Story of Balder's Death and Loke's Punishment has attracted many a gifted author and some whose gift was genius. Nevertheless we do not know that any one has ever rendered it into more saga-like English verse than Cornelia Steketee Hulst, whose book has been published by the Open Court Publishing Co. (3s. net). It is enriched by a selection of illustrations from the rare series with which Frölich illustrated the Eddas. Take this short portion from Odin's last submissive speech :

'Lo, a Vision is rising before me—
Humbly I thank thee, thou Weird One !—
I see Him, with sight that is certain . . .
And not Death, but Life Everlasting,
For His palace has sheltered no Evil !
That Mead that Hel brewed, mingling floods
Of all Fountains of Life, He will drink,
And all Wisdom, all Good will be His.
And the Dead that in love drink those waters
Are His, the Redeemed and Blessed,
For that Mead when they drink will transfigure
Their ghosts, and new bodies will clothe them
With Strength and with Beauty immortal.'

E. R. Jaquet.

Mr. E. R. Jaquet is the editor of a volume of poems relating to the War. The title is *These Were the Men* (Marshall Brothers ; 3s. 6d. net). He has gathered the poems, not from the obvious sources only but from all sources, including *Punch*, the *Spectator*, and the daily newspapers. And in every case he has named the author and the place where the poem has been found. Quotation is difficult where all are exceptionally good ; for this editor knows a poem when he sees it. But we

¹ Francis Grierson, *Illusions and Realities of the War*, 75.

cannot be wrong with Katharine Tynan. The title is

PEACE.

Some day of days the peace will come,
The houses break to banners gay;
With trumpet and the sound of drum
The people make high holiday.
Go quietly, oh, people dear,
Because—a broken heart may hear.

From Land's End unto John o' Groats
With bonfires shall light up the skies!
The shouting of a myriad throats
Shall to the startled heavens arise.
But Rachel weeping for her dead,
Weeps on, and is not comforted.

The men will march a-down the street,
The broken boys that were so bright:
What of the unreturning feet
That will not come by day or night?
The darling heads that lie alone,
This one and that one's little son.

Red Armageddon shall be past,
The Thousand Years of Peace begin.
No roll of drum or bugle blast
Shall wake the sleepers with their din,
Or lift the broken heart again.
Behind the shuttered window-pane.

German or French?

Mr. Harvey Carson Grumbine has given himself to a thorough study of German and of French war poetry. He is, moreover, an accomplished translator. In a volume entitled *Humanity or Hate: Which?* published by the Cornhill Company of Boston (\$1.25), he has given translations into English verse of thirty-two German war songs and thirty-two French. His purpose is to compare one set of songs with another and so arrive at the difference in mentality between the German and the Frenchman. The German songs are by Sudermann, Lissauer, Herzog, and others; the French by Botrel, a former Laureate, Arcard, a Member of the Academy, and others. We need not repeat his conclusion. Let us quote a fair example of the German and a fair example of the French songs. This is by Will Vesper:

LOVE OR HATE—WHICH?

The Father of all Love, who died,
Jesus the Saviour crucified,—

Once in a dream I saw Him give
His love to men that they might live.

He spake to me as from above:
'Sing not in hate, but sing in *love*!'

Feigning I did not understand,
I quickly took my pen in hand,

And wrote: O Lord of Love, my hate
Is deep as love and high and great!

I tell Thee truly, eye to eye,
My hate does all Thy love defy!

And this because, O Holy Dove,
My hate is born of purest love.

My Fatherland is nigh to death;
I hate all foes to my dying breath!

That is the German song. The French is by Maurice Allou.

A LETTER FROM A GERMAN MOTHER.

'Each day brings here, my son, a train of
Russian brutes.

They bend their lumpish forms with low and
sullen groans,
As, in the villages they go as raw recruits,
Bearing burdens heavy enough to crush their
bones.

'Their sombre visages peer out from prison-
bars.

I hate them; for they are the authors of our
woes.

So, spare them not, but slay; the bloodiest of
wars

Must mow them down in droves! What men!
What beasts! What Foes!'

The letter ended with maternal tenderness.

A Russian found it folded in a dead man's
vest.

He sent the spiteful missive back to her
address.

But, as a glow of pity warmed his savage
breast,

He quick bethought himself and added this in
Prussian:

'Mother, your son is dead. I pity you.

'—A RUSSIAN.'